

4. Special POST Council Meeting Minutes Approval – April 14, 2016

SPECIAL POST COUNCIL MEETING

MINUTES

APRIL 14, 2016

The meeting was held at the Idaho State Police, Cafeteria Conference Room, 700 S. Stratford Dr., in Meridian, Idaho. Chairman Kevin Fuhr called the meeting to order at 9:05 A.M.

Council Members Present:

Henry Atencio, Deputy Director, Idaho Department of Correction (for Kevin Kempf)
Jan Bennetts, Prosecuting Attorney, Ada County
Dan Chadwick, Executive Director, Idaho Association of Counties
Kevin Fuhr, Chief of Police, Rathdrum Police Department
Shaun Gough, Sheriff, Gooding County
Sharon Harrigfeld, Director, Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections
Jeff Lavey, Chief of Police, Meridian Police Department
Lorin Nielsen, Sheriff, Bannock County
Paul Panther, Chief, Criminal Law Division, Office of the Attorney General
Ralph Powell, Colonel/Director, Idaho State Police
Wayne Rausch, Sheriff, Latah County
Shane Turman, Chief of Police, Rexburg Police Department
Greg Wooten, Enforcement Bureau Chief, Idaho Department of Fish & Game

Council Members Absent:

Seth Grigg, Executive Director, Association of Idaho Cities
Doug Hart, SSRA, Federal Bureau of Investigation

Guests Present:

Trish Christy, Management Assistant, Idaho Peace Officer Standards & Training
Ann Cronin, Project Manager, Idaho Peace Officer Standards & Training
Lori Hicks, Financial Specialist, Idaho Peace Officer Standards & Training
Adam Jarvis, Division of Financial Management
Victor McCraw, Division Administrator, Idaho Peace Officer Standards & Training
Sande Meyer, Executive Director, Idaho Prosecuting Attorneys Association
Greg Myers, Manager, Collection Bureau
Rory Olsen, Deputy Division Administrator, Idaho Peace Officer Standards & Training
Madelina Rosado, RSM, Collection Bureau
Katie Schaltz, Account Representative, Collection Bureau
Josh Tewalt, Administration, Idaho Department of Correction
Cassandra Thigpen, Technical Records Specialist, Idaho Peace Officer Standards & Training

Bill Thompson, Prosecuting Attorney, Latah County
Marsi Woody, Financial Executive Officer, Idaho State Police

1. Pledge of Allegiance

Introductions of Council Members and Guests

2. Stakeholder Relationships

Kevin Fuhr: This was one of the topics that was asked to be put on the agenda for this meeting. I'm going to start it and then I'm going to open it up. I'm guessing that this is stemming from some of the issues that POST has had with IPAA for the funding and then also with IDOC with funding and some other issues. I've got it on good word that POST has been working with IDOC staff and trying to resolve some of the issues between the two departments as far as scheduling and some of the other issues. And so I'm hoping that between the two agencies that is currently taking place. And So I'm going to open that up and see if we're headed down within the agencies, if we're headed down the right path on that. And then anybody else that might want to chime in.

Henry Atencio: You know I think, I will start by saying that is an interesting comment that you make that we're working together. I will say that as of the last Friday, we had a graduation, we graduated, I believe our 57th academy for correctional officers, it went very well. And, this week, we had staff from, we had POST staff in our building working with our Training Manager to work out some scheduling issues for the 2017 training calendar. Reports I received was that that was a positive meeting, it went well. We have a meeting scheduled for next Friday as well, with in which I will be in attendance with some of our HR staff to look at the electronic packet submission process, I believe it will be our first review of that program, so we are excited about that. And so, I think maybe, in response to your comments, I think that that's in its infancy. We're just starting, I think that down that path. I think it's very hopeful and certainly I'm excited about that. I will tell you from a Department of Corrections perspective, we will do everything that we possibly can to maintain a positive and professional relationship. I think this week and last week we're off to a very good start and want to maintain that. And I will keep my involvement in that as well to make sure that we're doing our part on DOC's behalf.

Dan Chadwick: I would like to point out, talk about the relationships generally because there are two types of relationships that we have on this Council. One are the political relationships that we have because of the various entities that we represent and what we bring to the table. And two, the functional relationships that we have because of the training and the Administration and all of that that we have to deal with. And I think we have to keep our eye on the ball on both of those, they're both incredibly important, the political relationships that we have when we go back IAC, the sheriff's, the Chief's Association, Fish & Game, State Police, the Governor's Office, the Prosecutor's Associations, all of those relationships matter in what we do around this table and Henry's comments about rebuilding that relationship with Department of Correction is incredibly important. And, we have to be cognizant of that as we address these issues. That's not how we make our decisions, but we have to know that those relationships are back there and we have to be willing to acknowledge them and work within that framework in order to make the

right decisions for law enforcement and peace officer training in this state, so, I think that we can't just say, okay, we have this relationship with IDOC that has been not the best in the world or the IPAA. We have a lot of relationship issues here that have to be addressed and I think we have to be cognizant of that, think about that as we work through this process. So, I just want to put that on the table and have people think about it. The political relationships are important simply because, and I'm not talking about partisan relationships at all. I'm talking about the nature of relationships between organizations that have certain positions in this state and they have to be acknowledged and we have to work within those, and we have to have good relationships there. And if we don't, then we are not going to get ourselves out of this issue that we have right now.

Kevin Fuhr: So, Mr. Chadwick, I have a question based on just what you said. You're talking about relationships politically, political relationships with people that sit, or the agencies that sit within this organization. Are there bad relationships with organizations that are represented here or outside of this body? I know that, like I said, I know IDOC and POST has had some issues and we, we went through a little issue with IPAA, but are we talking about more, other than those two, are we talking about other ones that you know of?

Dan Chadwick: I'm talking about the nature of the relationship with IDOC, the nature of the relationship with the prosecutors, the relationship with Misdemeanor Probation, relationship with the Sheriffs when dealing with Dispatch and Detention officer training. Not just Patrol training. I'm not saying they're bad relationships. What I am saying is those relationships matter and you have to have that conversation with all of the representatives of those entities in order to make this job successful. We have a lot on our plate as, as a member of this Council. And so, we have to have that basic good political relationship first before we can even get into the responsibilities that we have. Cause you want to eliminate as many of those problem areas as you can, so that we can do the job we need to do as a POST Council. That's all I'm saying. We have to acknowledge it, we have to put it on the table, we have to know that it exists and we have to address it and deal with it. It isn't just black and white here. I'm sorry, but if anybody thinks what we deal with is black and white decision, that's not true. We do have black and white decisions to make. But, sometimes those black and white decisions will step on toes that don't need to be stepped on. And we have to be cognizant of that, be careful about claiming kind of thing. That's the context I was hoping we were going to talk about today.

Jan Bennetts: I wouldn't characterize the issue with IPAA as little. I think it is, it's a significant issue. And I think, and we've talked about it and we had Grant Loebs speak to sort of what we bring to the table, and, I think I would say we feel like or we have felt like we're fighting for our life to keep, the what I think is fairly small percentage of a very large budget. And, I think that it's not, I think fair to characterize it as small or little. I think it's kind of permeated, it's grown, and I think we have a lot of work to do.

Henry Atencio: I think Mr. Chadwick's comments about relationships are, I think those are great comments, and I think at some point, this Council also needs to talk about, inquire why agencies are seeking to leave the campus and conduct their own training. From my perspective, that should be a concern for this body. At some point, if agencies choose to leave at some point, they're going to choose to take money with them. Which I think will also add to the problem, the

financial problems here at POST. So that's something that this Board needs to discuss and figure out why is it. I think there's like at least four agencies who are looking to leave and do their own training. Should be a concern for the Council from a financial perspective and also from a consistency in training and that professionalism that we're striving for through this Council.

Kevin Fuhr: I'm going to chime in, but then I may ask Colonel Powell to make a comment. So, seven years, eight years ago, I helped NIC get their college program going. And, it wasn't any slight on POST, it wasn't to pull our folks out of POST, it was to have some regional training so we could get people locally to attend the college program, go through the academy, and be able to stay home with their kids in the evenings, amongst other reasons. But, it wasn't an issue with POST, it was just, we wanted to start this regional concept. We didn't pull any money away from POST, we still don't. The agencies pay for it. So, I look at, and maybe that's the college programs are different than ISP and Boise PD pulling away, but I would also say that Boise PD started this same program back in 2009 or 2010 and tried to do the same thing. And, I don't know that it was necessarily a POST issue, I think it was more, they wanted to do the training in-house. And so, and I could be completely off base here, so I'm going to ask Colonel Powell if the reason that ISP pulled out was regarding POST or was it just to try to do something in-house?

Ralph Powell: A good question, and Henry, I'm glad you brought that up in terms of specificity. The terminology that I keep hearing is, it starts as a good question. But, I think the semantics are wrong. To say, we've got a problem because people are leaving POST is mischaracterized, it's not even PC, it's not politically correct. That's not what's happening. Certainly, from the ISP standpoint, I'm not going to speak for Chief Lavey, but, Meridian PD's been in the same meeting I've been in and when we're talking about possibly a local group, which involves Meridian PD, Ada County, Garden City, we might all look at having training. The purpose of making the request to have the privilege, or the opportunity to incorporate the POST curriculum into our own academy isn't because there is anything wrong with POST, we don't want to secede from the union from POST. It has more to do with hiring timelines and not having to wait for a Patrol Academy to roll around to get your people into. Now when I speak in, about that, that's more about what I understand from county and city agencies that have that interest. It's, we can hire this many, our budget's here, and when we get them hired, we want them in an academy. We don't want to have to wait for the patrol academy at such and such a time. And on top of that, worry about exactly how many positions might be available when that does come around. And, so there is an ownership on timelines. It has nothing to do with, I'm leaving POST, I am so fed up, I'm throwing my hands up, we're seceding from the POST union. Absolutely nothing to do with that. In fact, we worked, as we all know from the reports from POST, hand in hand making sure the curriculum handoff is exactly what's needed to meet the POST standards. So, I reject the idea, I believe it's mischaracterized, a little short of being offended because I've been in this business too long to not understand the semantics issue. But, I do reject the idea that people are throwing their hands up, they're running away from POST. That isn't, certainly not, with ISP and my understanding with meetings I've been in with local law enforcement here. Again, I won't for them. That isn't their perspective either.

Jeff Lavey: I'll add to that is, the Treasure Valley has seen a major growth spurt. And, we are growing so rapidly that we're bringing on lots of officers. And it really kind of segways into the whole financial thing with POST is because of the financial issues POST has had, they're

reducing some of the things that they do and academies that they do is, they can't keep up with what we need to. So, we have been looking at, we already put our people through an Advanced Academy of eight weeks. That we do on our own. And so, we too are looking at, well then why don't we just add the POST curriculum, teach the POST curriculum and then teach our stuff on top of that, then we don't have to burden the limited slots that POST has for all these other agencies, cause we have the ability to do that, to train our people. And it really comes down to slots. Financially, for us though, is because that monies go into the pot, into POST, we don't get that. So, if we pull our people out, we don't get that money. And, it costs me money, so I have to justify to my Council why I am not using POST for training and I'm doing it on my own. And it really comes down to we need the slots. We absolutely need the slots. And so, one of the things that, and it's on the agenda here, but, I think we really need to look at our mission here at POST, about what our scope of what we're trying to do, and we need to get back to basic law enforcement training first and foremost. And then, if we have the staff, the time, the resources, start adding on these additional things. Because that's what hurting us, it's actual slots in the academy. And the timing of those, is trying to figure out ok, now, the next academy class starting up in September, but the budgets don't get approved until October, so I can't get people in the September class. Now I'm looking at okay, I got to wait until the end of January what do I do with those people when they'll hire them and the other thing that we're facing is, every single law enforcement agency is finding it very very difficult to hire quality applicants. And if you find a quality applicant, and you don't jump on board, and get that person hired, someone else is going to hire them. And, whether it's in state or out of state. And, we can't risk that either. And so that's really kind of what we're facing, is, just getting people through the academies. So, what it's forcing me to do is go after lateral positions and then I'm the hated person in the valley because I'm taking everybody else's limited trained people that they have because I don't have an academy slot to get them through. So it has no criticism at all on POST. In fact, I believe POST has made some major, major strides and improvements. And it really comes down to communications, currently, and some great people here. But, I think we really need to redefine what we're trying to accomplish here.

Shane Turman: So I just met with all the Chiefs in eastern Idaho. And, as you know, ISU is now structured a 15-week academy instead of a nine month one. And most the agencies over there right now are sending, or are going to be sending the first, to this first academy, all their new hires. And I'm actually sending one. And, Colonel Powell and Chief Lavey said, one of the issues that had is, so we've got an academy in January then we have one in March. And then the next academy is clear around the end. And so, there are issues with the hirings. I had a person I hired. They ended up quitting about a month later, so by the time I get my next person and then I go through all the background checks and making sure that everything is done proper. I can't get him into the March academy and so I've got a pretend officer for most part of the year that I'm trying to deal with. And that's what those chiefs, it's not a money thing, cause it's costing me \$800 to send him to the academy. And as I met with them, it's not the financial part, but most of the, all of the chiefs were in favor of taking, of being able to pay a little more, take on more of a financial responsibility to POST academy such as with ammunition. And, I was actually quite surprised at how much they'd said we'd be willing to cough up some money to POST, but, they want academies, either more academies or spread out cause it's just not working with the hiring process and the time frames and all those things. And, it's got nothing to do, cause it's cheaper

for me to send them over here. The only, the other thing is just being able to have them home, they like that point.

Kevin Fuhr: So I'm going to go back to what Dan Chadwick said just a little bit ago as far as the relationships go and we've got every agency in the state represented, or, I should say, every agency and then the Chiefs and Sheriffs Associations represented on this Council. And, so our responsibility as council members is to help with communication with our respective agencies or associations. And there have been issues in the past with communication between POST and chiefs and sheriffs, I know of specifically. I know that, that is getting better. I know years ago things would happen and nobody would know about it until it happened and then I'd be getting phone calls saying POST just changed the rules here and nobody knew about it. There's more communication going out as you can see from the e-mails from Rory Olsen and Victor McCraw. But some of that falls on us as Council members is to make sure that we communicate with our respective agencies and associations. But, so you know, some of that falls on us, some of it falls on POST as far as communication and making sure that we contact our stakeholders and make sure that they're involved in some of the decisions that are being made. So, I think that would go a long way as far as repairing some of these issues. With IPAA, just the fact that we can sit down together and start working on some funding things together, I think might help fix some of those issues.

Dan Chadwick: I think Jan Bennett's comment about the relationship with IPAA and Henry Atencio's comment about the relationship with IDOC, I think we have to talk about those and talk about how important they are in the context of this Council. If we don't actually take them out and talk about them now, then I think we've wasted our time today. I have to be honest with you, that relationship issue, I think we have to take some time to delve into that a bit and find out what that relationship is like, where it's been, where do we want it to go as a Council. And then we talk about the budget side of it and say, okay, this is the relationship we want, and this is where we want it to go, and this is how we want to address it budgetarily. So, I don't think anybody ought to be shy about talking about it here because I think Jan's pretty concerned about the relationship between this Council and I think Director Kempf and Henry Atencio have both been very clear about how difficult the relationship has been. And I think we better take it on and talk about it, and I know that everyone else is talking about access to training and services. I don't know if that goes to the heart of the relationship. I think that goes to the issues of training as opposed to the relationship, but maybe it does. Maybe the chiefs have something more to add to that, but we had better talk about that.

Shane Turman: Let me ask the hundred dollar question for me is, I know we've had the issue with the funding for the prosecutors. But, I guess I'm missing the boat here on other than a budget issue, what is the problem, the relationship, what is the relationship problem? Other than the financial.

Jan Bennetts: I think it's broadly everything we've talked about. It's communication, it is approach. For example, I guess one of the, when we were first approached about budget, it wasn't hey, can we work together to come up with a solution to help IPAA meet its mission. It was, essentially, we're going to have to cut your funding, which we can't cut. We've talked about that, we've looked at every possible way that we could cut. We've had two or three

strategic planning meetings at IPAA at the Board level to figure out if we could cut. If we do lose funding, how do we then make it up. What else can we do. We've looked at other alternatives, and we're looking at those things, but we don't have a plan in place. And we're looking at potentially July with the new fiscal for POST not having the funding we need to do the training that we've already committed to doing for the next two years. So it's been an emergency for us. And we've had a lot of conversations and I think there've been a lot of discussions but it hasn't been productive. Instead of working together, as I think what we are doing today is a first step to us, I think it feels like the first step for an opportunity to have the global funding discussion about POST rather than can IPAA cut it's part of what it gets. And I don't know, not to speak for IDOC, but I imagine that's similar to cutting IDOC resources.

Wayne Rausch: I agree with what you're saying, and I agree with what Dan Chadwick is saying too. But, I think that the funding situation is what's driving everything. The relationships, and the whole ball of wax, and I think what we're not talking about, and maybe what we really need to talk about, there is a real groundswell of frustration and impatience and change coming in this country because our representatives and senators don't pay any attention to what the will of the people is, very little of it. And there is a definite need for funding. If we believe in the fundamentals of law enforcement and public safety, you have to be pretty myopic not to look out here and see what's going on. And what we're doing is we're trying to deal with a situation that's not being dealt with by the next realm up the ladder. They're ignoring it. If we try to come up with funding remedies that's somebody's sacred cow, they don't want to do it. We have to have an ear of the people that make the decisions in this state, and maybe even beyond in order to expand the amount of funding that is at POST, is with law enforcement. A good example is if we had that, we would be expanding POST, we would be, there's a bigger demand. The population of this state is growing, it's common sense, POST needs to grow. We need to have more room, more classes, we need to have more people instructing. These are necessities and to me, what we're doing right now is kind of rearranging furniture on the Titanic because we're trying to operate within this little space that we have. But it has to be expanded. If we don't expand, then we can maybe work out a few relational problems and things like that, but are we ever going to really find the solution to what the problem is? POST needs funding. Law enforcement needs more funding. And we need to get the ear of the people that can make those decisions. One of my thoughts is let's see an increase in alcohol tax and give it to POST. Oh, you can't do that. Well, we have to do something. I see this is all interwoven. And the relationships come because of funding problems. And that's why things happen, like, well, you know, what, we're going to have to eliminate some of the Correction academies because there's no funding, or we're going to have to drop the Prosecutors Association because there's no funding. Well let's solve the funding problem and we won't have these jagged edges in our relationship. I think that's a huge part of it.

Kevin Fuhr: Jan, I'm going to ask you this question. I don't know if you have the answer to it. Prior to this year and to the funding issue, has the relationship between POST and IPAA...

Jan Bennetts: Been excellent.

Kevin Fuhr: So, it was this year, it was funding communication and just the way that we went about talking to IPAA about the funding issue.

Jan Bennetts: I think the focus was on, I think it is what Sheriff Rausch is saying. I think it was the funding issue. We're kind of the, for lack of a better word, the low hanging fruit. That's really the, whether it was intended or not, I think that's how we reacted to it and how we felt about it. Because we tried to do I think what the Sheriff is saying. I think we said, hey, let's come up with a bigger plan. We've talked about what can we do to join shoulder to shoulder with POST to solve the larger funding issue. Can we have a discussion about that? Because to me, that is the issue. I totally agree that I think communication and relationships need to be steady throughout despite funding issues. I think that's when you should join together even more, versus pitting us against each other, which I'm not saying any of that was intentional, it's just that's how, sort of, I think it results.

Jeff Lavey: This is just my opinion too, is that, and listening to everybody here and I have not agreed more with the Sheriff than any of the meetings ever. Not that I disagree with him, but, the relationships are just symptoms. And I was talking about jumping ahead to the number three, and the relationships are important, but, everybody's survival instincts are kicking in. We are trying to survive. That's what we're trying to do, and it's affecting our relationships. It really comes down to the root cause, and the root cause the Sheriff hit on, it's funding, and it doesn't make any difference where you stand politically but listening to the current presidential candidates talking about training, and training of officers, and we're going to re-train, and we have to change this, and change that. Who's paying for that? But, whether it's retraining or changing the training, they've keyed on it--it's training. We need to train police officers, law enforcement personnel to maintain or improve the level of service in this society. And we don't have the funding currently to do it. We've proven it. Is the \$15 a ticket and the decline in the tickets is not keeping us afloat to do the vision that we currently have of POST and it keeps shrinking, shrinking, shrinking, shrinking. And we're all fighting for survival and in the process people are getting hurt feelings or it's creating some animosity, and it's hurting our relationships but the root cause is exactly what the Sheriff just said.

Kevin Fuhr: So I'm going to go out on a limb here, and say that if we've had a great relationship with IPAA in years past, that we had a little hiccup this year, that if we can work together on the funding issue that we'll get our relationship back to where it was at.

Jan Bennetts: Absolutely, and I think it's beyond hurt feelings in the sense that, I think prosecutors and law enforcement of all groups need to be standing together. And we need each other. All of us in this room, we need each other and I think we work very hard in the trenches to do that. We've worked really hard at POST to provide training, to be available, to do what we need to do to help, and so it's almost like, it's a little more than hurt feelings. I think it was more like, hey, we're not a partner anymore, we're not a stakeholder anymore, we don't need each other anymore. And it is a symptom of funding and I absolutely 100 percent agree about that, but I also think that we have to commit to being partners together in this. And I think if we do that, we will find solutions to address the funding and figure that piece out. Because we all bring things, great ideas and opportunities, we've had many discussions about how we could change funding, and we'll get there. And, what we could do, as partners, but if we're not all standing together, and I think that's the piece that I just want that clear that we are partners. We work together. We care about what happens to each other.

Kevin Fuhr: I'm going to go out and speak on behalf of POST and say I don't, the intent wasn't to minimize the relationship or to strain that. The intent was to try to find relief in some of the funding, some of the expenditures, and maybe the way that was handled, we could have done a little bit better. But, that wasn't the intent. The intent wasn't to minimize the relationship, the intent wasn't to devalue what the prosecutors bring to this. I was at that first meeting with you and IPAA and the intent wasn't to strain those relationships. It was just to look at areas where we could save some money. And so it's unfortunate that it took that turn, but I think if we can get over those meetings and that initial trying to cut some funding and let's start moving forward together, and be united in this, we can come up with a fix.

Lorin Nielsen: This meeting has been needed for a while. I am more of a half full than I am a half empty. I do know that we did a little exercise at the Idaho Association of Counties, and I still have the hat. We put a hat on our head and we said, now put on the top of that hat, what is your hat, and I put Sheriff of Bannock County. Well, when I'm at the Association, I am an association representative, and I need to start looking at the Association. When I'm around here, I'm a POST representative of the whole Council. I am a sheriff. I do have, like Dan Chadwick was talking about, I do have the interest of my profession and my agency, but when we're here at POST, that hat is a POST hat. And, I look at the funding and I notice as we were talking, let's put some of the stuff that we've had in the past behind, but on the other hand, it doesn't hurt us to dig some of that up so that we could bury it deeper so that we don't just skim over the top of it because then it will grow again. I think that as a united Council that we can get the funding. Look at the insight that we have and the relationships that all of us have with our particular constituency and also the Legislature. Do they have their own, yeah. Do we sit back and say, ain't that a shame? But if we can all, and I don't know if the state's allowed to lobby, but I am, and we can start putting this together. The whole public safety issue, I grew up in the 60's, I arrived in Chicago right after the riots that they had there. We're heading in that same direction if you see how things going around. In Idaho, we have agencies that are totally underfunded, totally undermanned, and we have to work together on that is what I'm hearing. I really think that we can do that, but I would hate to leave this meeting and not have everything taken care of. At least brought out in the open so that when we do start on a fresh, everything is fresh and we don't have anything rotting in the background that might mess up that atmosphere later on down the line. I think that we can do this. I think that with all of us and the people that we represent, they're going to listen. And if not, then we have the public on our side. So there are some things, I'm not talking about hostile things, but I think that together we can come up with a plan and then be able to get it through. I strongly believe in that.

Paul Panther: I just wanted to follow up on something that it said, which is statutorily POST has just as much obligation to fund prosecutors as they do to fund anybody else. So to the extent that any part of the folks that come to POST should end up feeling marginalized, they shouldn't because statute lays out where POST money has to go, and it includes prosecutors, peace officers, all kinds of other folks. Correctional officers aren't specifically mentioned, but they fall into the "including but not limited to" category, so, we're all equal partners in this and if we prioritize, which it looks like we're going to move into that piece here pretty soon, we need to remember that there's no group that has any lesser standing or claim to funding than any other group does. Somehow we're going to have to parcel that out in terms of what's appropriate proportionally,

and that's going to be a challenge, but I think the prosecutors have every bit of a claim to POST funding as do peace officers.

Dan Chadwick: I just add onto what Paul had to say if you look at the statutes. The Chief Law Enforcement Officer in every county is the Prosecuting Attorney along with the Sheriff. And so we cannot forget that. That should give this Council pretty good perspective about how important the prosecutors are. It's no one else but those two offices by statute, so to try to marginalize an office, and I know the intention was not, but the fact is, it's more than hurt feelings. It has nothing to do with hurt feelings. It has everything to do with respect for the position and for the office. And that's why communication relationships matter. If we misstep and misfire in those relationships, it screws everything else up. I don't care that it's funding. Funding is the big deal. But if we screw up the relationships, then we are going to be back here again and we are going to be talking about the same thing again and we are never going to solve the basic problem. So I just think we have to be clear about that, and I really appreciate what Paul said about that. We have to have that perspective here. That's what's important.

Henry Atencio: So I'll make a couple of comments about relationships and budget as it pertains to the Department of Correction. Had you asked me the question that you asked Jan, our relationships have not been good with POST and it stems a number of years. Why is it surfacing now and why haven't we talked about it? I can't answer that cause I wasn't in a position to have those discussions. But they've been going on for a long time. And, obviously they've come to the surface in the last year or so. In my opinion, I think part of that, is a budget issue. A belief that the Department of Correction is only a consumer of POST services and that we don't contribute to the overall budget. I think we've been successful as an agency in dispelling that misnomer, and setting the record straight if you will. We are a consumer. We are a large consumer, but at the same time, we are also a large contributor to the overall funding of POST. Chief Lavey talked about our basic instincts kicking in. We're going to fight for our seat at this table, we're going to fight for the academies that we need. We have to do that to properly run our agency. From a budget perspective, I think as we look at trying to increase funding, the first thing we need to do is look at the model that POST operates under today. Are we doing everything we need to do? Are we doing it the most efficiently? And, I think in a sense we're trying to do a gap analysis but we're trying to identify the gap before we actually say, hey, here's what we need. And I think if we can sit, take a step back and look at, again, are we doing everything that's in the charge of the POST Council, are we doing it efficiently? If the answer is "no," then we need to look at the model. If the answer is "yes," then I think we have a basis to ask for an increase in funding. But I think from the Department of Correction's perspective, we probably won't, we need to see that gap analysis done first. Are we spending these resources as efficiently as we possibly can across the board? I think that has to be part of that discussion.

Shane Turman: We're talking a lot about the financial resources we have available there. I think one other thing that ties into that is also the time resources. We have 365 days in the year, it seems like to me, sometimes we're asking POST to do 370 days a year. Seems sometimes like there's a lot of just every organization wants a POST stamp, I don't, do we have the time resources too, to get everything done that we need to along with the financials.

Kevin Fuhr: And that goes to the question that Henry Atencio posed earlier, and that was, as far as these academies, these agencies that are pulling out of POST. Actually, I think these agencies that are talking about pulling out are actually going to help our overall cause because it's going to give us more rooms in the dorms, and it's going to give us more seats in the classrooms and it's going to help alleviate some of those time constraints, or some of those overages. The Administrator asked the question and that is, we're talking about POST. POST does this, and POST does that. And POST has this relationship and POST has that relationship. When we talk about POST, who are we talking about? Ourselves? Because who's POST? We're all sitting here representing POST. So when we talk about POST does this, and POST does that, and POST funds this, and POST funds that, who's POST? Who are we talking about?

Wayne Rausch: To quickly answer your question, I think it's all of us, and we can't, it's kind of like the NA meeting where you shouldn't use "we" statements, you should use "I" because it includes all of us. I was just going to say to your earlier statement, I think we have to take a look once again. It may be something that initially helps the financial problems that we're having by having the State Police or Boise Police Department, or whoever step outside of the parameters of POST here to train their folks. But, that's just axiomatic of the problem that we're talking about. That just reinforces if you will, the argument, as Henry Atencio was saying here earlier, I think we have done a pretty good job in the last couple of years of analyzing what POST does, what POST trains, what things need to be taught and what things can be taught by the agency. We spent a lot of time working on that. And I think what we've narrowed down to now is once again I'm going to say the issue is the funding issue. You wouldn't have to be too sharp not to notice, that we're trying to do what we can possibly do and it's still not making the ends meet. That has to have the attention of the Legislature and there has to be a solution to this. But we can't keep having agencies leave POST because there's not enough academies available. Once again, what is that, that's a funding problem. POST isn't big enough. We don't have enough classes. We don't have enough people training. All goes back to that. I agree with Dan Chadwick, there is certainly a relational issue there. You have to be able to sit down at a table and look each other in the eye, tell each other how you feel about something and work towards a solution. And if I can't sit down and look Dan in the eye, and he can't do that to me, then we're not ever going to get anywhere. And you're absolutely right with that. But, beyond that, it all goes back to the fact that the state is growing larger, we're having difficulty finding candidates. We're losing candidates to places that pay better. We have a crisis that just continues to unfold. And we're not addressing what the biggest problem is. And that's that we need more money to make this work properly.

Paul Panther: I'm going to make a motion that the Council convene into executive session pursuant to Idaho Code 74-206(1)(b) to consider the evaluation, dismissal or disciplining of, or to hear complaints or charges brought against a public officer.

Shaun Gough: Second.

The motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

Paul Panther made a motion to come out of executive session. Lorin Nielsen seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

3. Assessment & Prioritization of Services

Kevin Fuhr: We're going back to start talking about funding and the lack thereof and what we want. And we've been hearing all morning, "training, training, training." Getting back to what we're supposed to be doing, so we have to figure out what we want to spend money on. We talked about it this morning, this body is what decides the financial spending of POST, and so let's open it up and talk about what we want to do.

Shane Turman: It's a small thing, but you can't believe how big of a thing it is in reference to what we're funding. The little cheat books, the Code books. That caused a storm over there from the chiefs. And every single one of them said please have them do that, and we will pay for them. We will pay for the cost of all that. It's just a stupid little thing, but huge.

Lorin Nielsen: And I think that that may not be a bad idea. If you want them, pay for them, and have them ordered at first. If you don't need them, all my guys have I-pads and they have access to have that out. They don't need them. But, if it's a source that we've been providing that can be paid for by the users and not by POST, to me that's a win-win.

Kevin Fuhr: Here's my only concern. And one of you could probably answer this. POST expends the funds to build the books. We get funds coming in from agencies to offset the cost, but do those funds come back to POST or do they go into the general fund?

Lori Hicks: As a reimbursement of an expense, it would go back to POST's fund.

Shane Turman: And they would even with the cost of labor figured into it. Total cost for those.

Victor McCraw: There is a labor cost in putting those things together. The on-line version was not only easier for us to put together, but it gave out more information. It's available by smartphone, you don't even have to have an I-pad. It's much more user friendly and has much more information available so it's a better product in itself. Convenience wise, when you don't have radio, or computer in your car, a PDF version could be put online and Rory will have to comment on that, how that PDF version would work. That would alleviate the money going back and forth. If we produced and published the PDF version, the agencies could print it at their discretion.

Dan Chadwick: If you want to go ahead and finish the conversation on this issue, I have a broader question about what we're supposed to be doing right now. My question goes to what do our trends show, how much revenue are we taking in, what does it cost per academy, what are our priorities from our Basic Academy to the Detention Academy, to Misdemeanor Probation, to Juveniles, the Prosecutors share that we're paying. So, that's what I thought we were going to do rather than get into the minutia, but just to support what the Administrator just said, that's a great idea. Anything that you can put on the website as a PDF. But I'm more concerned about the bigger picture and where are we in terms of our trends and our collections and what are we going to have available and where do we have to make our decisions and our recommendations to the Administrator.

Kevin Fuhr: We've got what you're talking about as far as the academies, the revenue, what their expenditures are. We've got all of that already listed out.

Dan Chadwick: Could I suggest then that anything like we just talked about, that book, if there is a list of things like that, that you're aware of out there as chiefs and sheriffs and consumers of this service, let the Administrator know that maybe he could easily put all of that stuff on and he doesn't need the Council to weigh in on it. Because quite frankly, that would be his decision, in my opinion.

Kevin Fuhr: When we talk about that, we talk about processes and also money saving areas that this automation of the packets and stuff, I think is going to be a huge timesaver for POST. It's going to save a lot of man hours, which is dollars, so they're automating these processes, not just for a time saver, but also for a budget saver, which I think is a great place to go. The PDF issue, I actually had a sheriff that I spoke to last week when this came out who even with the PDF, he still wanted the books. And I'm just sitting there going, POST isn't just going to make books just for a few agencies. The e-mail that Rory sent out talked about doing the PDF this year, but getting away from it after this year. What is the time constraint to do this PDF as we go forward compared to compiling the books and all that?

Rory Olsen: Trish can answer the question about time to do the PDF, I've never actually built the PDF before. Trish has. What I do know is this. I looked at how much did it cost us in printing costs and postage only. That's all. I didn't figure in staff time to do anything. Just printing and postage and it was over \$6,000 per year spent on those books just in printing and postage.

Gough: Is it possible to make an app for that? I don't know anything about building apps.

Rory Olsen: I sent an e-mail out a week ago or so where we have made it an app, it's a searchable deal online. You can search them online. What it is is that on a computer, you have to be online the first time, and you hit the app, but after that, you can search offline. The computer can be completely offline and you can search it. On a smartphone, you do have to have either a Wi-Fi connection or you have to have a data plan connection to be able to run it on a smartphone. But I did talk to the computer programmer that helped build that. And he said somewhere down the road we could look at seeing if we could make it so that it will even operate on a smartphone offline, but that will be somewhere down the road still.

Jeff Lavey: But that doesn't help with the agencies that are using the argument that they have no computer or smartphone.

Kevin Fuhr: But then that goes back to the PDFs.

Lorin Nielsen: Or cell tower to get it.

Kevin Fuhr: But every agency in this state has a computer in their office, so if we put it on a PDF, every agency could then, in their offices, print the PDF for their officers. So it would cost some to print the PDFs and those of us that have MBC's in our cars, we wouldn't worry about it.

Jeff Lavey: I don't believe that this is the right meeting for the book. I would only want to add to what Dan Chadwick said, is that I think we have to take everything he just said and then look at what do we have to provide statutorily, and what do we provide because we just think it's really cool and neat. We have to get back to the basics and what we statutorily have to provide, and that's where we need to start.

Kevin Fuhr: Let's move Agenda Item #3 to after lunch, and see if POST staff can put the projector up and can show us the numbers that talk specifically to the academy costs, our revenues, and I got some forms when I was down here the end of last week that I think would help us make some of those decisions. POST staff, can we do that?

Rory Olsen: We can get something set up. We're just discussing the logistics.

Kevin Fuhr: So let's push #3 to after lunch and then let's hit that first thing after lunch and then we can go right from that to the funding issue.

4. Enforcement & Collection Procedure for Agreements to Serve Contracts

Lori Hicks: So what I prepared exactly, I thought I'd just kind of give you an overview of where we're at and then ask whatever questions you might have for us, so you've heard me all go over the model developed in 2008 where we came with the cost per student. We're still using that, which includes an allocation based on students on campus for all of our indirect costs. And those amounts just once again, \$10,374 for Patrol, \$4,064 for Detention officers, \$2,343 for Correction officers, and \$3,105 for Probation & Parole officers. We calculate this every year using that same model and the numbers for 15, which I think I've given this group before, would be \$11,387 for patrol, \$5,352 for detention, \$2,915 for correction officers, and \$4,131 for probation & parole. Looking at the total as a whole of our two-year agreement debt that's on the books now, is \$701,800 roughly. And that consists of 315 open accounts. Reading through some past minutes of discussion and seeing the number \$800,000, which it was close to one point, we've written some off, collected on some so it's a little different now. What I wanted to point out was that not all of that is money we can realize. \$266,000 is comprised of 132 accounts that are past the statute of limitations for collection, so those are off the table. We're still carrying them on the books so we still have record of them, but we can't collect on them. \$63,454, twelve accounts, currently on hold. We're not collecting on them because those people have come back to law enforcement and are employed. We're hoping they'll fulfill their agreement that way. \$112,200 or sixty-three accounts, actively paying us on a monthly basis or almost actively, within the past few months they've made a payment. And then the, so the actual backlog that we're looking at is about \$260,000, 180 accounts, that we would possibly turn over to a collection agency if we were to go that route. Before we get into what we've researched with collection agencies, there is a proposed rule change, and so I'll let you go ahead and read through that, but what that would do is, and Cassandra can probably speak a little better about that, it would make it so that if somebody leaves a certified law enforcement position when they went through POST to an administrative position where they're not POST-certified, we've been allowing those types of positions to count towards fulfilling their two-year agreement, and this rule change would basically make that so that doesn't happen anymore. They have to fulfill their

obligation in a position that would normally be a POST-certified position, if I understand that right. What we're looking at for a backlog is one's a collection agency, and we've done some research on that. It's authorized in statute 67-2358, which allows public agencies to contract with collection agencies, and also allows us to add a contingent fee of up to 33% to be paid by the debtor. So some representatives from CBI are here who can answer any questions you might have for them. They're who we're looking at. They work with Fish & Game. If we were to do that, there'd be no cost to POST. Whatever they recoup would just be a benefit to POST. Last time we used a collection agency we were paying 15% and contingency would be out of our receipts, but in this case POST contingency fees would be paid by the debtor. We are working with Purchasing Department over at ISP to make sure we get through all the right steps as far as do we have to go out for competitive bid on all this and that sort of thing. Right now we do have a potential agreement from CBI that we're looking at.

Kevin Fuhr: What are you seeing as far as percentage of collection rates?

Greg Myers responded in a normal environment, right now we're at about 30.9% overall. That's our entire database. But when you're looking at an employed, we base it on age and information, and you got people that are former students and they're probably working now because some of them are fairly old. We're going to locate them and find them and they probably have an employment where we can garnish, which will increase our recovery performance for your particular type of account. But you could expect at least a 30.9% recovery.

Kevin Fuhr: Right now we've got an outstanding balance of what'd you say, two hundred and.

Lori Hicks: The backlog is about \$260,000.

Kevin Fuhr: So you're talking \$70,000?

Greg Myers: Well also, you're talking about statute of limitations, and I'd like to clarify on the statute of limitations. In most cases there's no statute of limitations on a governmental debt, and if there is a statute of limitations, it only bars us from suing them in a civil court. We can keep it on their credit report for seven years. I think that you'd be in a better position to turn all those accounts over to us and let us determine whether they're past the statute of limitations to sue or keep on their credit report because if they're under seven years old, we can still blemish their credit, and if they moved to Pennsylvania, and they're trying to buy a house, they're not going to get that house until they pay you. So there is an insurance in that respect as well. We do collections for the Department of Fish & Game and the Department of the Real Estate Commission. And we handle them exactly the same way and our recovery performance, it does vary based on the department and type of consumer because you never know who you're going to find violating the law out there in the backwoods. But, in your particular type of debt, I believe that the recovery performance would be much higher than 30%.

Kevin Fuhr: Right now, the process is unfair. We have those that go through and that pay us the money willingly, and then we have those that go and they basically thumb their nose at us and say come get me. And so it's not a fair process. We have the honest people that are paying us the

money and we have people that are just saying forget it, I'm not going to worry about it. This actually evens out the playing field with everybody. And I'm in favor of it.

Dan Chadwick: I'm just curious about the aging on these agreements, and the oldest to the most recent. Can you give us an idea of what the aging looks like?

Lori Hicks: Of the \$260,000 backlog I mentioned, the average age of those accounts is about 24 months. The ones that are past the statute of limitations could be probably up to as old as upwards of ten years, some of them.

Jan Bennetts: Just to clarify, this money would go to POST if collected, not the general fund?

Lori Hicks: Yes, it would.

Jan Bennetts: On average, how much annually are we collecting each year now?

Lori Hicks: Last year we were at about \$80,000. This year we'll be at about \$82,000 according to our projections. Prior to that, we were around the \$50,000 to \$60,000 a year neighborhood. So we're doing a little better, but we could do better with some help.

Kevin Fuhr: And if it's not costing POST anything, the consumer is paying the penalty, so to speak, the fee.

Greg Myers: The law requires that you send out a statutory letter notifying the debtor, the consumer, that they are going to be imposed a statutory fee. You'll collect a bunch of money off that alone without even using us first. We'll help design the letter, we'll put it together for you. We won't even take a commission because it won't be in our office until after the 30 days expires notifying them that you're going to turn it over to a collection agency, which may have an adverse effect on their credit report. We charge interest under state law, there's a lot of other particulars that they're not going to want to happen to them, and it will all happen. You'll get a piece of it off the top without even. We won't make any money. We don't charge you any money anyway. It's a benefit to the consumer that you're giving them the opportunity even though it's under the statute. So you'll collect money off that letter, which you send out 30 days before turning the account over to us.

Jan Bennetts: Is there any negotiation process at all with your company or do you set that up with customers that, hey, if you can get x dollars. Is there any negotiation that goes on to satisfy a debt for a certain amount? A negotiated resolution.

Greg Myers: If a consumer conveys an offer to us, we will convey it to you and see if you want to accept it or not. We do that with every client that we have. We don't advertise that we will settle an account, which we lose money. But if they do present an offer to us, maybe because they're destitute or they're a hardship of some sort, and they say, it's a \$3,000 account and they want to give us \$1,000 and make it go away. We're going to convey that. We're going to let you make that decision, and if you do, then we'll take whatever decision you make.

Lori Hicks: I did bring that question to the Legal Department at ISP because it was asked if we could settle debt for less than is owed. And the answer I got back was that the Council may, at its discretion, waive part or all of a two-year agreement. So that sort of settlement offer would have to come through the waiver process.

Greg Myers: That's how it happens with our county clients and our city clients. A lot of them won't settle because it becomes discriminatory. You do it for one, you have to do it for everybody, and so most of them won't. But we do have a few cases up in Kootenai County with their accounts, and they went back to the commissioners and they got the approval to actually reduce the debt and that's how they handle most of them.

Wayne Rausch: How does that work out as far as timeline though, because what I've come to understand is that usually if there is a window to settle debt, it's usually a really short one. And so if it's going to require the approval of the Board, what are we going to start doing? Having special meetings all the time so that we can hear these cases and make that decision?

Kevin Fuhr: That's a decision we'd have to make whether we would want to even entertain the idea of taking a reduced fee. I'll open that up for discussion. What do we feel about that? Is getting some of the money better than getting none of the money?

Paul Panther: I think it might be worthwhile to explore the possibility of, keeping in mind that this is the Council's decision whether the Council can just simply delegate that to the Division Administrator and let him decide whether or not to settle those claims.

Victor McCraw: Nothing happens in a vacuum. Once the word gets out, every single person is going to request a reduced amount. So then the decision is what do we do at that point? Further question for everybody in the room is do you see this as a potential deterrent to an applicant who may be unsure about this career, whether they even get into it or not knowing that if they leave within two years they're going to owe POST? Is that going to reduce the applicant pool?

Lorin Nielsen: I've already had somebody that they want to apply for detention and then they get presented this and they quit that week after we hired him, before we sent him to POST. I don't know if that's a cultural thing that paying debts isn't something that's priority. They just want to try things out. But it's happened twice to us. So that is one stumbling block. But we as a county went to this, and I think you'll get a whole lot more by going through a collection agency than you're ever going to do it on your own. And I believe some is better than others. I totally understand and appreciate the waiver process, and I wouldn't want to eliminate it, but I wouldn't want to make it standard operating procedure either. Are we asked to today vote on whether we take on a collection agency or are we just discussing the options?

Paul Panther: I think we need to have a lot more information before we can make that vote.

Shane Turman: When we're talking about whether to allow a waiver of partial part of the money, but in my mind that sort of person has just flat out quit and doesn't qualify, but I hope that doesn't stop the waiver process for things like with a chief that's not the applicant's fault. We'll still have that.

Kevin Fuhr: I would think that, if it comes at no fault of your own, then that excludes them from the money anyway.

Shane Turman: Then my suggestion would be just don't allow the waiver on those clear ones.

Lori Hicks: The people do have the opportunity to start that waiver process when they're notified of the debt if they feel like they deserve a waiver. It could go through that process before it ever gets as far as collections, and chances are it probably will.

Greg Myers: The statutory letter is going to open up a lot of that window for them to call. They're going to communicate. We see it all the time. We work with the county or a city and say now the statutory letter, a lot of people are going to respond to that letter and a lot of this will be eliminated.

Wayne Rausch: What else do we need? What I'm looking at is if we allow this to keep percolating and go to another meeting, how many funds do we miss out on while we're sitting here spinning our thumbs. What do we have to lose with this and what do we need to know in order to make it happen? It seems to me like it's kind of a no-brainer.

Shaun Gough: Where we're not spending any money.

Paul Panther: I appreciate these folks coming here, but we've heard from basically from one vendor. There could be others. We don't have a contract in front of us. There's a lot of things I think additional information that would be helpful. My suggestion would be to have these folks go back and do a little more research, present us with who else is out there, and let us make a little bit more of an informed decision.

Kevin Fuhr: Did you put this out for other companies?

Lori Hicks: I'm still waiting on an answer from Purchasing to go over what we need to do in that regard.

Wayne Rausch: How did they get the information?

Victor McCraw: They've got a state contract.

Greg Wooten: They already have a state contract. It's already in place.

Lorin Nielsen: So you don't have to vet them because they're already on contract.

Paul Panther: Are they an approved contractor that can contract with any agency or are they just have a contract with Fish & Game and somebody else?

Greg Wooten: They just have a contract with Fish & Game.

Paul Panther: So there's two different kinds of. This is what I'm talking about. We need to sort out all this purchasing stuff before we agree to contract with only one party.

Wayne Rausch: But we could approve the concept.

Jan Bennetts: Right. That's what I was going to say. Could we move to approve the concept, to ask for this work to be done, and bring it back to the next meeting?

Kevin Fuhr: I think that's an outstanding idea. And the next meeting is June 2nd, so we're only talking about six, seven weeks.

Jan Bennetts: I move that we approve the concept, ask for the legwork and legal work to be done, and bring it back to the June POST Council meeting.

Lorin Nielsen: Second.

The motion carried unanimously.

Paul Panther: On the proposed amendment to the rule, I suggest that this go back to our Legal Department for further discussion.

5. Long-Term Funding of POST

Kevin Fuhr: Any thoughts on ways to fix the funding, and how we go about doing that?

Ralph Powell: I threw one out to the Governor's Office yesterday. I got it handed back to me. We have four directors of state agencies in here, so we had a get-together if you will. Chief of Staff met with us and wanted to make sure there's an understanding with us about what was on the table and what wasn't on the table in terms of agency directors marching forward. So frankly there wasn't any real surprise because if, as you look at the composition of our Legislature and what has been in vote and what has not, ask ourselves, any fee hikes, any taxes going up, is that popular with this Legislature, and the answer is "no." The suggestion I threw out, and it was already known because I'd mentioned it to right folks already, but that was a very small tax on liquor, beer and wine. So that information came back to us as that's not really one of the ones on the table. Though it was included or explained to us too that the formula for that tax breakout is something completely open for discussion, meaning when those tax revenues come in, they're broken out and they go different directions, and if we can work our allies in counties, cities and the state to figure out if that formula can be readjusted to divert some money towards POST, that was open. That's just a little information out there about what four of us can stand up and say, "We'll carry this for you." I'm simply saying we can't volunteer to carry that.

Kevin Fuhr: So Colonel Powell, they're saying, "Don't add to that tax, but if you want to divvy that up a little differently," then we can maybe have a piece of that pie.

Ralph Powell: Proposal to adjust the formula.

Kevin Fuhr: So who does that take money from?

Dan Chadwick: And the cities, out of their general fund.

Kevin Fuhr: That was my question. So who's going to lose.

Dan Chadwick: Now remember the Courts got that 2% surcharge added on for court operations several years ago as well. And that has become, I believe, a permanent surcharge now on the liquor by the liquor funds. Before the state gets a share, the counties and cities each get 50% of a local share. The counties have to pay up to 50% for community college tuition out of our share of it, and maybe even more depending on the location, so if you're down in Sheriff Gough's location, you may see his county using all of their liquor funds for community college tuition. Jerome County might be doing that as well. We went through a lot of negotiation several years ago with Senator Cameron and Senator Stegner, were in leadership, tried to manage that allocation. I don't understand why we don't do better in beer and wine taxes. "Don't tax my beer" was the big mantra years ago. Well, I'm sorry, quite frankly you're getting a break. Forty years plus with no consideration of a more rational taxation system on that. You've got to fund it. Don't even think about imposing additional fees on fines. Right now we're struggling with the allocation of the fines and fees and forfeitures. We're dumping more and more onto defendants and making them less and less able to pay. They just don't have the money to pay it, so they'll never succeed.

Shaun Gough: But they've got the money to buy the beer.

Dan Chadwick: Well then let's tax the beer. That to me makes a whole lot more sense than doing all of this other stuff.

Ralph Powell: And not that that was a silver bullet. Just sharing that that's what happened to the one idea at the state government level. And to be sure, as a Council.

Dan Chadwick: We take it out of the state share, that's way okay by me.

Ralph Powell: That's an option there, but they're probably just as protective.

Kevin Fuhr: I look at our alcohol sales. A lot of what we deal with in criminal justice system deals with alcohol-related stuff, so it's a contributing factor to what we're doing. Good times or bad times, during the recession liquor sales I think actually improved. It always stays pretty consistent, so we're not worried about that. That and I'm not going out and telling my officers to go write more tickets to my citizenry, which is a bad PR move. It would be bad for the Legislature to go tell my guys to write tickets and have them not like their legislators because of it. So it would be nice to find something that wasn't geared towards punishing the citizens. It would be nice if we could find some traction because I don't think taking a piece of the pie out from organizations that are already receiving the money is going to bode too well for those organizations.

Wayne Rausch: Or the opposition that we're going to get if we suggest it.

Kevin Fuhr: AIC and Association of Idaho Counties are going to be right off the bat against it because we're taking money out of their pocket.

Sharon Harrigfeld: Dan Chadwick, do you know what that distribution is completely?

Dan Chadwick: We actually do. If you look at the liquor dispensary report, you can get statewide distribution numbers as well as county by county and city by city distribution numbers.

Kevin Fuhr: Colonel Powell, based on your conversation yesterday with the office that you were at, if we went to ask for an increase in the taxes, would they be opposed to that?

Ralph Powell: Yes, the Governor's Office is opposed to that. But we're only four members. POST Council can end up doing. The clarification was we won't be carrying in with that as an agency, State Police.

Lorin Nielsen: If we recommend it though, will there be repercussions from those of you that sit on the Council?

Sharon Harrigfeld: I think we have to think it through. We're all appointed by the Governor, and I think that what we heard yesterday is it's not as much, it's being mindful of the Legislature that we have right now, which is what I think Colonel Powell was saying, is that with our Legislature, it wouldn't go through. It's not going to go through. And so, with that in mind, it's probably not an option that we even, and we've done that. I get it and Colonel Powell was very clear about that yesterday that what all of us do alcohol has a direct reflection to every one of us. We get that, but it's not a direction that we can go. So, if there's not a possibility that we can redistribute the funds, and we talked about that as well. Is there a way to show the benefit of it. But it's not that the Governor is saying, "No, won't go forward with this." It's that logically look at what we have, and is it something that we want to lose political capital over because it's not going to go anyplace. So it's more that.

Kevin Fuhr: It's a losing fight.

Wayne Rausch: But you can't sell any program if you don't sell it. I think that that precludes the fact that a concerted effort of organizations, the Sheriffs Association, the Prosecutors Association, the Chiefs, Idaho Association of Counties, everybody, if you actually educated the people and told them this is what we want to see happen, you're trying to tell me that we wouldn't get any grip with them at all? They're just going to ignore that group of people?

Kevin Fuhr: This is where it would be good to reach out to maybe some people to sit on a committee and ask them if they thought that it would fly or not, if there would be traction, and if not, if they had recommendations on where we could maybe look.

Ralph Powell: We have some volunteers in the body of the Legislature that have agreed to come sit on this subcommittee that the Chairman has mentioned to just answer questions for us. This

is likely, this isn't likely, with this process you will drown and a snorkel won't help you, this process might.

Kevin Fuhr: Are those volunteers leadership folks?

Ralph Powell: Yes.

Kevin Fuhr: Perfect. That would be great.

3. Assessment & Prioritization of Services (continued)

Lori Hicks: I'm going to start with this picture of our revenue trend. As you can see, FY03, the highlighted colored areas, FY06 is increase to funding from legislation when IDOC came on board. Fiscal year 10 we had a bump over here in the 14% of 10% because the tax match-up program was implemented where they were taking people's tax returns to pay their old fines. It was a short-lived bump. And then FY13, we see the latest \$5 increase from \$10 to \$15 on the fine. You can see how numbers trend. We get a bump and it's great for a while and then we fall back off, then we get a bump, and then they fall back off. A shot in the arm, and then things filter away. I'll show you a graph to help visualize a little better, but the top section of this spreadsheet is our appropriations over the years. This includes our misdemeanor probation appropriation because they're not set to appropriate before that, although it's a separate funding taxed separately, you can't spend that for operations. Personnel expenses, operating expenses, capital, and T and B for our total expenditures, and this is specific to our fund 0272. It doesn't have misdemeanor probation in it, it doesn't have our federal grant funds in there, or our Project Choice money in it. Coming down a little bit, there's our total fine and fee revenue on this top bolded line. That's isolated because that's the main funding source, that's our bread and butter. This line is revenues made up of dorm fees, in-service class fees, two-year agreement receipts, self-sponsored students, everything else, for our total revenue. This yellow line down here is highlighted because it shows through the years when our total revenues have been exceeded by our total expenditures. That's happened with just the fine and fee revenue seven times out of the last ten years. Then if you come down a little further, this is the same calculations, our total revenue to include all the miscellaneous revenue.

Ralph Powell: So we have seven of ten years that we spent more than we earned, so to speak.

Lori Hicks: If you're just looking at fine and fee revenues versus our expenditures from our main.

Ralph: Powell: How do we pull that off?

Lori Hicks: We had cash savings coming forward from a previous year. That'll show up too when we get a little further down here. This line down here is the same calculation to include the miscellaneous little revenues that come in. Looking at that, there were three out of ten years where we still spent more than we took in. This pink line over here, I added to include our FY16 year-end projection. I just wanted to give you a picture of that trend continuing as we're going forward. This is our year-ending cash balance for the years, and you'll see in 10, 11, and 12 our

year-end cash balance was pretty good, and that's how we were able to keep spending. We had that reserve, so to speak. Going into 12, 13, and 14, it was pretty good and then there was the land purchase and it withered away after that. The appropriation reversion line here, this is spending authority we gave back at the end of the year. Our dedicated fund doesn't work like general fund where you get a bucket of money at the beginning of the year, you spend it through the year, and at the end of the year you give anything back that you have. This is not money we got, this is spending authority we got. What this shows us is that the Legislature is giving us the spending authority to run operations, but we don't have enough cash to support that whole appropriation. This grayed out area just references our MPO revenue versus expenses. Down at the bottom, this blue line is our personnel expense and this goes from 2005 to 15. Increases through the years after 2006 when we got additional funding and hired more folks. Then here again there were some PCN's added in those years, three of them. Two of them were shifts from operating expenditures to personnel, but they're not really new money. This orange line represents our total fine and fee revenue. The lighter blue line above it is our total revenue including miscellaneous funds. Then the big thick red line is our total expenditures. You see the shot in the arm you get with the 2006 increase and it drops off. Another shot in the arm with our \$5 increase, and then you can see it's dropping off again. The concerning part of this graph is right here at the end where you see our revenues and our expenses. Our operating expenditures trend along with our revenues good because we have to balance our expenses to our cash. When cash isn't there, we have to spend less because that's the side that we have control over.

Victor McCraw: Our current payroll for POST employees every two weeks is approximately \$75,000. On our weekly reports, we have dropped below that amount several times, literally having less in the bank than is required to pay POST personnel, and hoping that in the next week or two weeks afterward that the county moneys come in enough to continue. Whenever it drops below to a concerning level, I make it a point to forward that to the Chairman so he knows what's going on.

Lori Hicks: The report that Mr. McCraw is speaking about includes encumbrances so we're deducting obligated funds to come up with an available cash balance, so we might have a little more cash actually sitting in the bank, but it's got an encumbrance attached to it, which means we can't spend it.

Kevin Fuhr: How many POST positions that are allocated right now are unfilled?

Lori Hicks: There's three vacant positions right now.

Victor McCraw: Of those, the only replacement we are seeking right now is one Academy Training Coordinator. And that's to maintain academy operations. Without that position, things would fall apart with running the academy classes. However, one of the administrative positions that will become vacant, depending on direction from the Council, hopefully today, Rory and I had a lengthy discussion yesterday about some of the non-essential duties that Chief Lavey was talking about. If we get Council permission to at least put those on hold for a while, we may not have to fill that position immediately.

Kevin Fuhr: And so those salary savings that we have from those open spots and then the possible future open spot.

Lori Hicks: We're projecting for the end of 16 our salary savings will be about \$190,000.

Kevin Fuhr: Can those funds be used in other areas or is it only salaries?

Lori Hicks: The cash that we saved can be used for other things, but the appropriation itself we can't use. The only other thing I wanted to mention was that I have updated financials as of March. Our projected year-end cash balance for our dedicated fund is about \$217,000. It's improved a little bit because our revenues have come in stronger, and we're being careful of our expenditures of course, too. We generally see fine revenue go up from March to May. That's the peak.

Jeff Lavey: We have two-and-a-half months left in the budget. Lori Hicks, I thought there was a mandate that we keep \$300,000 on the books. What's that looking, cause I don't think we are. How far off are we going to be and what penalties can we potentially face if we don't do that?

Lori Hicks: The target cash balance for the end of the year has kind of been a moving target. It's not statutory or anything like that. It's something that we set, and it's \$300,000. We're going to be about \$80,000 short if our projections are correct. The reason for that is just to make sure we have sufficient cash on hand to cover our expenses going through July as the new fiscal year starts up before revenues start coming in.

Marsi Woody: As a point of clarification, the salary savings that we are experiencing right now, that cash can be used for operations.

Adam Jarvis: That's if you have the cash. If you have the spending authority, what she's saying is that you have \$100,000 in spending authority that you could use, roll down in FY16 for capital outlay or operating expenditures. However, the question is do you have the cash to spend, so you have the spending authority that you could roll down, but the question's cash.

Sharon Harrigfeld: So the salary savings could be used for that cash in FY16.

Adam Jarvis: There's no penalty for falling below the targeted year-end cash balance of \$300,000. Internal policy that ISP has, just a good fiscal policy to make sure that the agency has enough money carrying over into the first pay period for two weeks to pay out the salaries and any other expenses they might incur prior to those receipts coming in. It's not a statutory obligation. It's just practical policy.

Jan Bennetts: I have a question about the operating expenses. Outside personnel, we have other people come and help train, and I realize there's a training position that you need. You have other folks come in and we're paying them to do training. What's the budget for that? If we're able to, with IPAA resources, to bring in trainers to help on the law piece that prosecutors could train, would that have any measurable impact at least in the short term?

Lori Hicks: Our projected expenses for Professional Services for instructors, graders, role players, and the like is going to be almost \$400,000 for the year, so \$398,000 and change.

Kevin Fuhr: I believe that POST has reduced some fees for travel and per diem for instructors coming over.

Victor McCraw: That's correct, and I believe that one of the documents is everything we've done to date to mitigate the lack of income.

Kevin Fuhr: Were they not making \$25 an hour plus you were paying mileage and traveling expenses?

Victor McCraw: Correct.

Kevin Fuhr: So I think those have gone away.

Lori Hicks: This is a list of the other things we've tried to do. We've delayed replacing equipment. In the projection I gave with the \$217,000 cash balance at the end of the year, that's still including all the capital items that were in our budget to be purchased. We haven't purchased those yet. As we get closer to year-end, if the cash isn't there, we won't. We've delayed hiring to fill vacant positions, use local instructors where we can to reduce travel expenses, POST Council meetings are being held here because there's less travel expenses involved if we do it that way, lower mileage reimbursement for contractors, decreasing patrol academies from four to three, the agencies providing the vests, we increased the dorm fee effective January 1, 2015 from \$10 to \$16 a day because we weren't recouping on settled costs we're seeing with the dorm, and now student handouts are electronic rather than printed, the Criminal Code Index which you discussed earlier, we turned in certain equipment we had on hand and swapped for equipment we needed more, we worked with the CJIS department over at ISP to create automated processes and to replace some of the programs we currently pay licensing and maintenance for of our software for various things.

Kevin Fuhr: That's one of the things we talked about as far as automating the forms and stuff is that will save POST staff which obviously saves dollars. Do you have the breakdown of costs of academies?

Henry Atencio: Just want to add DOC eliminated an academy as a cost-saving measure as well. One that will run as our own challenge academy.

Lori Hicks: Column B is patrol. This is the model I talked about when I talked about our two-year agreement calculation. You've got everything directly related to patrol plus their allocation are all in this column for a total for the year, number of students, and the cost per student. Column D is detention, column E is dispatch, column F is correction, G is juvenile detention and juvenile probation.

Dan Chadwick: What is the annual demand for students and classes for patrol? What is our demand and what is our projected demand on an annual basis?

Kevin Fuhr: Are we filling the three academies at fifty person each, and then have extra students after that? Or are they not filling up?

Victor McCraw: Rory Olsen would be able to tell you what their calculations were at the time that Kevin Johnson considered cutting out the fourth academy because the numbers were low running four a year at that particular moment, and then compared to what they are now. I don't know that either one of us would be able to tell you what the projection is as far as the upcoming need. From Chief Lavey's statements, the need is there.

Jeff Lavey: At that point in time when that decision was made, it was absolutely the right decision based upon where the cities and counties were, but that was several years ago and things have changed since then. It's great that we are reducing four to three to save money, but I think we're in a situation now where we could probably fill all four of those. We alone are hiring fifteen in the next year.

Kevin Fuhr: One of the reasons we cut that academy is we were in the recession and not too many agencies were hiring at the time because they didn't have the funds for it, but now we're on the flip side.

Jeff Lavey: We're not in that recession.

Kevin Fuhr: The need is back there, but unfortunately we just don't have the revenue for it. This is where these other academies and then there's the college programs come into play is they're a good alternative for some agencies to keep them from having to fill up a spot at POST.

Rory Olsen: What I've seen in my history with POST, everything is cyclic, so what happens is is when the economy goes down, we get into a bad economy time, the amount of officers that are coming through the academies go down, but our expenses stay the same unless we reduce an academy. But then at some point, the demand starts to go up for officers and we need more academies, but the funding hasn't caught back up yet either, so we keep going in this cycle all the way through life and it's never at the same point at the same time, and that's part of the problem is the two don't catch up at the same rate.

Shane Turman: Is there a way possible to increase the number of students in the three academies to open up more slots?

Kevin Fuhr: So instead of fifty as a max have seventy as a max. Will the classrooms even hold that many? And then my next question would be is that when you start getting higher student ratio to instructor ratio, your scores are going to drop.

Jeff Lavey: And you need more role players and things like that.

Dan Chadwick: Ninety-five is reflective of three academies for the year. That's what the projection is or is that what the actual academy.

Lori Hicks: Ninety-five graduates for fiscal 15.

Shaun Gough: That's fifty-five students short of the max.

Dan Chadwick: That's why I'm asking the question. If that's where we are, where are we right now in terms of are we getting more applications than we have slots for for this fiscal year. We're in the last quarter of the fiscal year, so up to this point in time, you just started an academy two weeks ago, so were all fifty positions filled?

Henry Atencio: I think I heard Lori Hicks say that POST purchased some land for dorms. Is that correct? So if we're talking about agencies leaving POST, I think POST is now an open campus, it would decrease the need for those dorms. Maybe your discussion is should we sell that land and build back our bank account.

Ralph Powell: Well no. Two fronts. It's good thinking. We're looking at options. One of the main reasons for the purchase of the land for the dorms is the problems we have continuing and ongoing with keeping this dorm building going. It was built more like a hotel, every room has its own shower instead of the true dorm style where there's a group of showers at one end. Just this week we had yet another pipe break. It's a money pit, so it needs to be replaced, and the new dorm. Your point's well made, but our numbers are going to go down, we don't need more room, but we still have an efficiency issue. This one is costing us more than it's worth. The other response would be if we sell the property, we get back the \$500,000, but it's a one-time thing. That's not an ongoing solution, it's a one year plug it back up to \$500,000.

Lorin Nielsen: Is the state required, the State Police budget to come up with the physical building or do they have that out of a different line item where they would, a building fund type line item. Does POST Council have to come up with that building or is that something the state does in a separate line item?

Ralph Powell: The proposal will be taken to the Building Fund. Typically that's general fund dollars that we're asking for. POST under agency code falls under ISP, so it would be presented as part of our budget, but like the budget we had in front of us, POST is billed out separate. Marsi, anything to add on how we go to the State Building Fund for building requests?

Marsi Woody: We have requested it several years already through the Permanent Building Fund, and it is our number one priority at this point.

Paul Panther: Just in terms of the way the budget process works for POST. The money from fines, fees, and such goes into the POST training fund, which is a dedicated fund. But the Legislature still has to appropriate that money in terms of the line items and all that. So when does POST submit its, is POST's budget submitted as part of ISP's budget when it goes?

Lori Hicks: Yes.

Paul Panther: And does the POST Council review that submission before it's made to the Legislature?

Lori Hicks: I don't know.

Paul Panther: I don't recall that ever happening, and my larger question is, the statute that I'm referring to is 19-5116, which says POST Council shall expend money in the fund for certain purposes, and my question is whether we're doing our job or not if we're not reviewing that budget submission before it's submitted because I think it's the Council's decision as to how that money is being spent, and it seems like part of that would be to review that budget submission.

Kevin Fuhr: I don't know that in the time I've been on the Council that I've ever seen a budget before it's gone to the Legislature. We may see some of the proposed expenditure items. I remember a few years ago we bought some big refrigerator and we had a van and some other things like that, but as far as the whole budget, I don't know that I've ever seen it before it's gone to the Legislature.

Dan Chadwick: The heart of where I was trying to go is how many patrol academies do we want to have authorized in our budget, how many correction academies, how many of the other academies. What is our capacity, and what should our recommendation be to actually satisfy the needs that we have identified as a Council. That's what we need to be doing, and I have no way of even thinking about that unless we get a little bit better handle on.

Paul Panther: I don't know how we do that if we don't know what's being submitted or have some say in that.

Dan Chadwick: That's exactly right. That's true. That's the deal, so that's why I'm asking these questions. How many academies have we done? Is that three up there now for this year?

Rory Olsen: I ran just patrol for right now, and this goes all the way back to when we started in this system in January 2013. These are the numbers from, this is the oldest academy to the one that will be coming up here later this year. So what this is telling you is here's how many applications we got in this column, how many were approved, and how many students started the academy. Now you go how did it go from 39 to 40, that's, comes up with again like last minute approvals types of things. This is what your student count started off with in the academies. This is how many applications I got, so you can see we are starting to get down in here, we had 60 here, we had 53 here, so you can see you're getting more application packets come in versus our maximum seat capacity, which is 50. To answer the question about seats, could we put more people in a classroom, yes we could, but then what it starts to become is a trade-off. The more bodies you start to put in there, the more compact they are, the less conducive the learning environment starts to become for the students. As was already mentioned, then you start having ratios, role players, graders, instructors, so it's a trade-off on what you want to do. Could we physically pack more bodies in there? Yes. What we've shown over the years is 50 is about as many as you want to pack in there for any length of time and have people be able to still study and learn and concentrate and that kind of thing.

Kevin Fuhr: This last year, does that say we've got 50, 45, and 45 or somewhere in there?

Rory Olsen: Right here is this year. Last year we had 59 applications, we accepted 50. We had 60 applications, we started with 49. My guess there is we had 50 but somebody dropped out at the last minute. Here we had 53 applications, we started with 50. We roll into this year, we started with 53 applications, we started with 48. That one I do know. Last minute people dropping out or not making it. Here we had 50 applications, we had 45 start. That's the academy that's in right now is 45 started.

Kevin Fuhr: So three academies were close to or within 5 – 10% of maxing them out.

Dan Chadwick: So what is the cost? Three academies. What is the cost per academy times three for each year. So what is the actual cost?

Ralph Powell: Does the cost change on the number of students?

Lori Hicks: Keep in mind that this calculation allocates all of our indirect costs, which some of them are fixed.

Ralph Powell: It doesn't matter how many students for those costs.

Jan Bennetts: So how do you figure that out?

Lori Hicks: I've working off of memory here, but I believe that the direct costs of patrol academy are around \$120,000 per academy.

Jan Bennetts: Is this regardless of number of students?

Lori Hicks: No, that wouldn't be because that would include meals, ammunition.

Jan Bennetts: So that's maxed out 50.

Lori Hicks: That's an average.

Kevin Fuhr: So you're talking \$360,000 for three academies.

Dan Chadwick: You allocate the indirect costs to each academy, so what's that additional cost?

Lori Hicks: It's not going to be really discernible from this calculation.

Dan Chadwick: But what is it? We have to account for that cost per academy. That would factor into the overall budget.

Lori Hicks: I don't have that number right now.

Victor McCraw: It would be different because it's a percentage and we spread it across. Some disciplines take up more behind the scenes admin non-direct costs than other disciplines. That depends on the number of academies, number of students, number of applications received that

either become students or don't become students, that are students that become certified or don't become certified, and it's a huge moving target.

Lori Hicks: If I recall correctly, when I worked this up, and I isolated, and it was different with the different programs just a little bit. Most of them were within about \$30 of \$400, so it was about \$400 per week for each of these per student calculations, so it was \$400 per student per week of indirect costs was what.

Dan Chadwick: It's ten week academies?

Lori Hicks: So \$4,000 per academy.

Rory Olsen: Patrol is ten weeks. Other academies run differently.

Lori Hicks: That would be per student though, so you have to times that by the number of students in each academy.

Dan Chadwick: So that's why it will vary per academy because of the number of students that you have.

Jan Bennetts: It might be hard at least to figure out here what we could do, but if you look at the professional services cost being \$400,000 per year across all academies, and that may be because I know last time when Director Kempf gave his presentation about IDOC, he provided numbers of what he was bringing for instructors to help do the instruction, and again I'm wondering, in the short term if that is something that we collectively with our agencies can bring to the table to reduce that cost. For example, IPAA can work on a plan to bring instructors for the legal work, knowing that there's a curriculum and knowing we have to make sure that it's consistent. I'm sure we can work with the Attorney General's Office to do that. Are other agencies able to do what we and I think what Director Kempf said they're doing for their academy to bring to bear resources to help us through tough times while we work on a long-term plan.

Jeff Lavey: I get that, but we can't. The idea is we are so short-staffed because we can't get people hired and we can't get people into the academies trained to cover for those people that are leaving to go do other duties. We have all hands on board reacting to take the calls, and so that's why we don't. It's not that I refuse to because I have a great partnership with POST, but I used to allow our officers to go over there on our time to train. I can't afford it. I need them on the streets now, and so our officers still come over here and train, but they're contract employees. That's for us, and my guess is you're probably going to find that quite regular through the whole state.

Kevin Fuhr: We even deal with that up north. NIC take instructors they're paying \$25 an hour, and some agencies send officers on their own dime so that the school doesn't have to pay for it. There are other agencies that say we don't have the manpower, and so the officers go on their days off and they get the \$25 an hour, so we even struggle with that up north.

Shane Turman: In looking at the academy numbers from the last three academies, and the amount applying was much higher than the amount that were let in, in fact the March academy was 45, so there's 5 openings that are available there. My question is if we have those 5 openings and we have 60 applicants, by turning away applicants that we could fill those 5 positions that maybe the only problem with it is they were short on the timeframe. There's applicants we kick out because of criminal histories or whatever, but isn't there a way that we could if you have that many applicants and if we have some that it's only like a time ruling kind of thing that we could get those extra 5 slots filled for agencies.

Victor McCraw: We looked at that. The issue is administrative, and promising services that we ultimately can't provide unintentionally, saying hey, we got a slot for your person and we have a dorm room for them, and then finding out later that we don't because we've pushed ourselves to the absolute limit, literally people getting their applications in and cleared on a Friday prior to a class starting on a Monday, and then supposedly showing up here on Sunday. It's just almost impossible. We end up with no dorm room or a miscalculated cost for the cafeteria which may or may not cost us money there. Student instructor ratios, all those types of things, so to create a buffer just to do the administrative work behind the scenes to make sure that this class runs as it's supposed to, we pushed that to the roster is closed four weeks prior to the course. So if we have applications in and those people are cleared four weeks prior. Usually we've got 50 cleared applications four weeks prior to the academy, we're ready to go. Monday morning we've only got 46 or 48 people in the seats. We start calling agencies and asking why, and then we find out the reasons why those folks aren't in there. It's just timing. If you're late for one class, you're early for the next one because we're constantly accepting applications, and the earlier we get those applications the better, and it will help us fill the classes as much as we possibly can. It won't help the agencies and I understand the need for. Three academies is cost savings, but four academies, what it gave you was the availability of academy almost every quarter, and there's an immediate need. Sheriff Gough brought to me an immediate need this morning. I need this person, and I need him now. I don't need him the next academy. I need him in this academy. If this academy didn't exist, I'm not sure what position that would put you in, and that's part of our dilemma too. Not only numbers of academies but timing and availability. The Council has to decide what is the cost of convenience of having academies available several times a year versus the physical cost of running that number of academies.

Shaun Gough: When you're trying to stay within state code cause I've got two more right behind him that are going to go boom, boom, boom, boom.

Dan Chadwick: When is our policy, when is our preference as a Council? We would prefer to have one academy per quarter which would make it four academies a year instead of three. That would better meet the need of the demand for the classes. So the next question if that's our policy, then that's what we should set as a policy. Then the next question is what does our budget allow us to do. Does our budget allow us to set that as a policy and offer four patrol academies per year?

Kevin Fuhr: I would add another one to that is there's a convenience factor of having one a quarter, but then there's also the fiscal impact as far as if we have three that are full as opposed

to four that are two-thirds full, so we're throwing money out each of those academies because we're leaving a third of the spots empty. Fiscally we're throwing money away at that point.

Dan Chadwick: That's a really good point. Do we have to finesse it that much because if that's the case, then we're better off staying with three academies and then allowing the agencies to do what they've been doing, and doing their own training. For example, go to the self-funded student program, go to the separate academies that are being done. That's the only other answer that we have. If we cannot afford to do four academies a year, then we'd better set our sights on three, but then what kind of assistance do we provide agencies like Sheriff Gough to get those students into some of those other programs. Is that a possibility?

Kevin Fuhr: What if we were to meet with the chiefs and the sheriffs on the patrol side and say we can do three academies a year, but let us know when it would work best or when would the schedule work best for you guys cause Jeff Lavey brought up the budget issue. If you start an academy in September but the budget doesn't start until October, you can't get somebody into September academy, so if we were to finesse the schedule, would that help the chiefs and the sheriffs with those positions in those academies?

Shane Turman: Yes, it would.

Kevin Fuhr: We can maybe accomplish two things at once. We can finesse the academies that would make the chiefs and sheriffs happy, but also stick with just the three academies so we're not spending more money than we need to spend. That goes to the communication, getting our stakeholders involved. On the POST staff side of that, is working with the chiefs and the sheriffs as far as finessing the calendar. If you knew ahead of time, a year out, is that something that's feasible?

Victor McCraw: Appropriation, allocation, budget, and funding are four completely different things, and funding is the most important thing because if it's not there, none of the other stuff that you've done matters. That's where we head. We can budget and we can make the budget look, from our projections, like we can support four academies. If the funding doesn't come in, at some point in time we're going to have to make the decision not to run that academy or not to provide a service, and I think the prioritization is when we find it absolutely necessary to cut something out, what gets cut first, and nobody wants to get cut.

Kevin Fuhr: What I'm talking about is we stick with the three academies, but if we meet with the chiefs and the sheriffs and finesse the schedule of those three academies so that we can start an academy in October and then when the budgets are starting and then start another academy shortly thereafter and then finesse the dates of the academy classes so it would help the sheriffs and the chiefs, but we could still stick with the three. That's what I'm talking about.

Victor McCraw: I've got a question for Lori because we have a projected calendar year 2017 schedule that's out now, and it's just the proposed schedule, and IDOC has some input on that schedule, and there are some other things, but it's far enough away that we have a chance to do some things with. My question for Lori is should we start scheduling our academies on a fiscal

year basis to make this process easier rather than scheduling our academies on a calendar year basis.

Lori Hicks: The benefit would be more as a service to us because our fiscal year runs July to June rather than most of yours which run October to September.

Victor McCraw: But the money that comes to run the academy is through POST. It's not through the agencies. I don't know if that would cause more of a problem. It would be easier to identify what our funding period is based on the academy schedules. Right now the last class of the fiscal year we weren't going to be able to make it. Our projections show that we weren't going to be able to do that seventh correction academy this year, which is why they're picking it up. But that's a temporary fix to the end of this fiscal year, and then we've got the rest of this calendar year, which is already scheduled to go, and if things don't look better, we might end up going through this process again. I don't know if in the finance world it would be better to schedule our services along with our finances or to keep it the way we have.

Rory Olsen: In answer to Chief Fuhr's question, could we do that, yes we could do that, but what you'd have to do as a body is keep the big picture in mind. If we finesse the dates for patrol academy, then we have to look at what are the dates going to be for detention, what are the dates going to be for correction, and what are the dates going to be for misdemeanor probation. If all we're talking about is patrol, yes, we could do that, but we have to keep the bigger picture in mind to schedule facilities. The last time I looked, just to give you an example, we were running 102 weeks of academy operations a year, so that means at some point in time, we've always got at least two academies running all year long. In reality we've got three or four so that we have at least some time where we've got down time to retool and get ourselves back up. You have to keep all the components in there.

Kevin Fuhr: At least as far as the patrol academy goes, most expensive academy we run. It's \$120,000 per academy. Having open seats in those academies is us throwing money out the door, so if we could schedule to make sure that those three academies are packed, then we're not at least throwing the biggest money out the window, and then the other academies we run, where we're not spending \$120,000 an academy, if those are a little shorter on seats, we're not throwing as much money out.

Jeff Lavey: We have to ask ourselves should we even be doing academies? We have four community colleges now that are doing the exact same thing that we're trying to do, and we have limited funds. We have to get in the weeds and say what are we trying to accomplish. We're still trying to put a bandaid on this in saying are we going to do three academies or are we going to do four academies. Why don't we answer the question should we be doing any academies, and if so, how many should we be doing, and then go from there. We're starting to sound like an airline now as far as we have to pack all these people in this thing before the plane takes off. I get all that, but if we have redundancy out there across four places in the state now, should we let them do the basics and us do the advanced. Those are questions we have to ask.

Kevin Fuhr: We would still have to have an academy here, and the reason I say that is because there are some agencies in the state that a) don't have access to a college program close to them,

and b) at NIC, for example, there are no dorms. Those are a go to and leave academy, so the agencies like Moscow and Lewiston and some of the agencies up north don't use it because they have no place for their folks to stay. They are still sending them to Meridian. It's more of a local regional thing where they can drive to and from.

Jeff Lavey: It sounds like we're not going to have a dormitory here soon if we can't get that new one approved, and this one's going to be condemned. If we don't replace it, eventually we aren't going to have one here either.

Ralph Powell: It's not going to be condemned.

Jeff Lavey: We have to think about that. If we continue to ask for it and keep going no, no, no, eventually it's not going to be in a livable condition.

Kevin Fuhr: I just don't think you can totally get away from it just because there are too many agencies in this state that don't have access to it.

Jeff Lavey: That may be true, but we have to ask that question.

Kevin Fuhr: On the DOC issue, so they right now have 7 academies, but I talked to Kevin Kempf and they've been working with POST staff to do the same thing that we're talking about with patrol. It sounds like they're not going to reduce their numbers to 4, but they're going to spread them out every quarter, which gives better ability for their folks to get the seats filled. They're reducing the number of academies, but they're finessing the schedule so that they can get these academies spread out every quarter.

Henry Atencio: That's correct. Finessing that schedule is really the key for us. We can't have four academies in the first four or five months of the year. It just doesn't make sense to do that. I can't remember exactly what the proposed calendar looks like. It might be 5 academies with a sixth being done by DOC, as an option for us to do it.

Victor McCraw: There's been a meeting since then. The meeting that Deputy Director Atencio was talking about earlier this week where the proposal was 4 academies, but they were not quarterly. They were stacked early in the year, but spread out. I think the first three were earlier in the year, and there was one later, along with a proposed IDOC pilot program similar to Boise and ISP, except within their discipline, if approved by the Council. So that was the last thing that we were presented with. Any of those are doable. We just need to know enough ahead of time to make all the arrangements that Rory Olsen was talking about because that will not be the only class on campus, and there are a lot contingencies to put into place.

Wayne Rausch: This reminds me of a game of Legos that's sitting in a big box, and we start stacking Legos because they have to fit a certain way. Then everything changes and now we're all pondering how we're going to restack the Legos to make them fit inside the box again. Quite frankly I'm glad I'm retiring because I don't want to come here and continuously be playing this game about trying to figure out how we're going to keep changing everything all the time to try to make the Legos fit inside the box. If some of these guys take and go to different academies,

do their own academies, but we know that we still need academies here, and the main reason they're doing it is because we don't have enough space here for people on a continuous basis, we still go back to funding. This is kind of like just an exercise in, I'm sorry, I'm not trying to insult anybody, but this is kind of boring to me because it's like we're not getting to the heart of the problem. The heart of the problem is we have to do something different than what we're doing right now or we're just going to keep doing this and doing this and doing this.

Ralph Powell: We have to know what we're funding, and so some of this discussion.

Wayne Rausch: I agree, but as you know, we've discussed this for quite a while.

Ralph Powell: In addition to Chief Lavey's point, there are two additional questions. As we look at the direction of POST, we're going to field these three questions. Is our vision to remain static or kind of looking at our future and saying if we lock in on x number of patrol academies – 3, x number of correction academies, x number of etc., this is our status quo. This is where we're going to be ten years from now, this is our vision. Then we can now address how much money do we need. Or are we looking at there's going to be an increase. We need to build for more training on site here at POST Academy. Then that vision opens up a different number for funding that we need to look at and address. Or something similar to what Victor McCraw and I have had discussions about or maybe I just heard him having discussions about the different way that they do it in Arizona, and so that vision would be are we going to be scaling back intentionally what is offered on campus here so that, whether it's the universities and colleges providing more of that training, and the ISP's, the Boise PD's, the Meridian, Ada County, Garden City, etc. that will be taking on their own academies because they have resources. Then the focus of POST Council and POST becomes certification driven. Then we know how much we need.

Wayne Rausch: When Gary Raney was chairman, we had this big philosophical discussion. As a matter of fact, I think that was the direction that we were kind of headed was that we were going to take and make this more of an online type of a thing. It was going to become all electronic. That was the whole point is that we were going to try to eliminate expense by putting a lot of this online, and only a few of the functions that absolutely needed people to gather together to learn in that kind of an environment was what POST was going to be about. Then it seemed like after he wasn't doing it anymore, we just kind of, that thing just went by the wayside, and we don't discuss it anymore. That was one of the potentialities was we'll bring them here for domestic violence and traffic stops and those scenario-based things, driving, shooting, but then the rest of it would be online from your own organization. Maybe that's the best way to look at this whole thing is to go back to what we had been discussing several years back. I don't know what happened to that train. It got derailed somewhere along the way.

Ralph Powell: POST Vision 2020 didn't fall off.

Kevin Fuhr: We had the JTA and then we were going to have that looked at to see how that would work with the 2020, but we lost our curriculum coordinator and we just got it filled. So that job task analysis for patrol is what we were waiting on to determine from that where we go.

Wayne Rausch: To me that would be a viable solution though.

Ralph Powell: It's not dead, but it fits into any one or all three of these questions we need to ask ourselves about the direction and vision of POST. What is it we want, and then when we determine what we want, we'll know what the funding has to be because we know how much money we're going to have to have. But whatever it is, where we're going.

Jeff Lavey: Arizona has a way of doing it, and Washington has its own way too. Washington is, in Seattle we have four academies a year, in Spokane we have two academies a year. Period. We know that going into it, and that's what we budget for. And we do everything in our power to make sure that they're filled. We can't be doing this three one year, four one year, two one year, and changing all the time. We have to come up with, and maybe if we do have to have academies here, it's two a year. Two a year, that's what we have here, and the priority is going to be these smaller agencies that don't have these resources elsewhere. We just have to think about that stuff. We're spinning our wheels on this discussion right now.

Kevin Fuhr: When you talk about Washington though, they actually had two in Spokane and then they canceled them during the recession because it got too slow, and then they just brought them back, so even they were adjusting academies based on needs.

Jeff Lavey: I agree with that.

Shaun Gough: Question for Jeff Lavey. If you're going to run your own, can Nampa PD send a guy to yours?

Jeff Lavey: Right now we are doing that, having those discussions, but the problem that we're running into is we have internal department cultures that can permeate that, and so we have to be real careful about who we let in and who we don't. We hire people that are the right fit, and part of that discussion is that everybody has to contribute, whether it's financially, whether it's staff. If you're going to have people in this academy, you've got to provide instructors or something. Yes, it would be open, but we don't have any visions of doing one yet. Right now it doesn't make sense to me to do it financially.

Victor McCraw: There's the three points that Colonel Powell brought up are great, and I think we've heard a couple of arguments against staying static and the problems with staying static. I'm not sure if we can afford to change things right now is the problem. But with the long-range planning, I think we probably need to look toward one of those other two options, building or scaling back, one of the two, and then sticking with it, making sure that everybody knows about it, banting everything around and figuring out what's what. Arizona only has fifteen counties. Sheriff Joe has his own academy, as do several other agencies. POST was out of the training business. POST just dictated standards, but POST also, Arizona's got a little bit more money, would supply money for every successful graduate to help support those programs, but the support came from, there were no paid staff. There were no paid instructors. Every person that taught at the academy was either loaned to the academy as a full-time employee of the academy still working for their agency, or they showed up on their own agency's time. And in partnership with POST, these things were run. And it's just been done for that long down there.

Washington has its own issues, and when the Spokane academy was closed, it caused every agency in eastern Washington a huge burden to send their people to Burien in the west part of the state. Geographically Idaho's the same. I think we would run into the same problem here, and I don't think we could deliver services like they do in Arizona because just having fifteen counties. It takes care of a ton of headaches. There's not forty-four different counties and forty-four different needs and forty-four different jail systems. It puts a burden on the system in different ways which makes a different picture in what and how many detention officers we need. So I think Idaho is unique, and I think we share some things with some of the other states, but I don't think we can look to any other state to solve all of the issues. With some general direction and we can start looking at options immediately in whatever direction the Council wants us to go, and start to bring back to you contingencies for discussion about pluses and minuses. It's a huge discussion, it won't be done today, but right now I'm not sure, short-term, if we can afford to do anything different than what we're doing. My fear is that something will fall through the cracks. One of the disciplines will end up not being served in some way if we miscalculate or we don't do it right.

Ralph Powell: Part of our dilemma that we face as we speak today is that, going back to what Victor McCraw just said, I'm not sure if we can afford to continue to do what we're doing now. We don't have the money. That's why we're all ramped up, is this projected shortfall. It's not \$600,000, but still we're falling short of money needed to continue the services that we've been accustomed to providing. I like the way Victor McCraw has framed this up. If we the Council can get the direction we want to go, get the homework assignment to POST and their staff, which took some of my staff too, which is fine, but then let them return and report on what the options are based on the direction of our vision, here's what you could look for in terms of options.

Kevin Fuhr: We're trying to send the training out to the regions. We have north Idaho, you guys have southern Idaho, ISU and CSI, and we start pushing the agencies to that and we do minimum training here, and again, I still argue we're probably still going to have at least one academy for some of those agencies. Is that something that we want to push out to the agencies?

Ralph Powell: I think it's way bigger than, and I know you're just making the analogy, but bigger than one academy. I believe it's more likely that as some of this attrition moves naturally, we will still have the need for the academies that exist. I don't see that reducing itself. Jeff Lavey already clarified with us this isn't something that's on his one or two year plan, which also means it's probably the same with Ada County, Garden City, cause that was a group discussion type thing, and ISP you're only talking seventeen seats. Boise PD a few more, but how many times a year, so I think we need to continue providing the service, at least that's my opinion about what I think POST needs.

Lorin Nielsen: For the twenty years that I've been a sheriff, we've talked about the possibility of going out, and we have even done that a few times. I know when Madison County built their new jail, they got seventeen people they need. When I built mine, all of a sudden I had twenty people that need to be certified that year, and you've allowed us to have our own academies, and so it's been going on for a little bit. What I'm a little cautious of is turning these over to the universities who have what I have found an ulterior motive as far as what they're doing on things, most of that being money and facilities. I don't think ISU has any dorms that they would

provide. I know they've got their own building, but there are also some philosophies at ISU that I'm on the board of directors for that, that I would be a little hesitant to put more in until those philosophies change a little bit, so I wouldn't want to count on it. I would like to have that option open because I think it's a good option, but I agree we're still going to have at least the same amount here as we have now.

Victor McCraw: Boise PD is beginning their academy July 10th. ISP's pilot program is starting May 8th.

Wayne Rausch: So potentially this year we'll see whatever sort of relief that those academies bring to this institution I would assume.

Victor McCraw: A little bit. I know that ISP had intended to hire more than seventeen troopers, and I think Boise PD intended to hire more than they're actually going to have as well. But we'll have those seats open.

Wayne Rausch: We're also looking at, if it progresses at an accelerated pace, at least enough to influence this year, we may see from what I understood by the presentation that was made earlier, we have a backlog of approximately \$260,000 and altogether I think that the quote that was given was we could potentially see another \$200,000 to \$260,000 come in if we implement going for the people that owe money to the academy, so it seems to me like in the not too distant future, there could potentially be some funds infused into this organization that would from want of a better word save it through this year, which would seem that maybe what we should do is continue what we had planned, what we want to try to do and try to change, but I don't know, as you know, trying to change IDAPA Rules and all that kind of stuff takes time. You can't just do it with a snap of the fingers, so maybe what we should look at is once again seeing what happens with some of these changes that we plan on doing, and then continue to pursue a meeting with legislators who can help us with some long-term plans. I agree we need to know where we're going, but at this point it doesn't really sound like we really want to cut back on what we're offering right now.

Victor McCraw: One of Director's Kempf's comments at the last Council meeting was he was very concerned about the additional cost to the agencies. What is this going to cost the agency? We're transferring something from somewhere to, it has to be paid for somewhere, and if agencies are buying bullets and then vests and then this and then that, when does it end, when is the limit, what does POST give, what do the agencies give, and how does this balance out. In the vision of 2020, transferring some of the burden of training, or the cost of training to the agencies is going to have an affect too, and I don't know what that affect is going to be. We can calculate what the affect will be for us here. I think there's going to be some unintended consequences though, and there will probably be some significant input from the Chiefs and Sheriffs Associations regarding that.

Kevin Fuhr: The underlying problem is we have no money. If we have the funding available, then the academies that we're currently holding, patrol, correction, I think we're in good shape for the most part if we have the funding.

Ralph Powell: Validating some of what Wayne Rausch has been advocating, if we go anywhere and ask for help, let's face it. The first question, it would be the first I ask, is how much. So we have to figure out how much we're short. To figure out how much we're short, we have to know how much we're providing. I apologize if it makes it look like we're chasing this circle, but now that we've opened this discussion up, it still takes us back to how much do you need. We have to figure out what we're short.

Kevin Fuhr: With what we've got as far as numbers and we know what we're spending for academies, we know how many academies we were running, if the 16-17 calendar's out, we know what the academies that we're going to run next year are going to be, and we know what the cost of those academies is, and we know what the staff expenses for those academies are. I think we can come up with, and knowing that POST staff has been over the last year or two cutting services and not buying equipment that's been appropriated, we have a pretty good idea I think as far as, we could walk in there today with Lori and show them this is what we spend on staff, this is what we spend on the academies, this is what we spend on the services we provide, and I think the POST staff has done a pretty good job cutting where they could cut to the point now where we're sitting there going okay, this year we're going to come up \$100,000 to \$150,000 short of where we need to be, that \$300,000. I would think that we would start at that point and say listen, we're coming up \$100,000 to \$150,000 short at the end of the year, so we need at least that much, and then if we're not buying stuff that's appropriated, add that to it, and so now, we need \$150,000 plus \$200,000 to buy mats and some of this stuff that's appropriated that we can't buy.

Wayne Rausch: Plus the \$300,000.

Kevin Fuhr: I think we could come up with a pretty good number just based on the information that's been provided that we need \$500,000 to be able to come in at the end of the month budget plus to be able to buy the equipment that we've been given approval to buy, and we need to stick with that. That's maybe kind of basic, but I think that number is there.

Ralph Powell: I didn't mean to imply that it wasn't. Just get it identified. Now fiscal year 16, we're on our own. Fiscal year 17 the budget's been set. Short of a supplemental, and that's a swear word. You don't say supplemental and expect not to come out with a shiner on your face.

Jan Bennetts: It seems like, and I know circling back to the funding, we have a short-term need that we have to figure out for what we just talked about, the 2016 and 2017. I think that is something that we need the immediate focus on, whatever that is. I don't know if there's grant money, if there are partnerships we're missing, if there are creative ways. That is a focus that we need to have. My thought is, for the long-term piece, which I think is bigger than what we're going to be able to accomplish here today, would it be appropriate to have a subcommittee or a smaller group with somebody who we can get dedicated from POST Council to be kind of the leader, help us with, and help us to for that small group to come back for a recommendation about vision and that group then reaches out to the sheriffs and to the chiefs and really digs in on what can we do because I think part of the problem is there are a lot of great ideas and a lot of thoughts about what we can do, but we can't afford any of them. So if we can deal with the short term and then come back with a long-term plan that includes a recommendation for funding, and

I think we can come up with a brilliant presentation that we then figure out who do we give that to. Is it the leaders in the Legislature that you were just talking about that have agreed to look to this? Are there private partnerships that we can have? Training law enforcement is a huge community issue that people would care about, that they want consistent, well-trained police officers across the state of Idaho, and there might be partnerships that we're missing in this that we can bring to bear as well, so is it worth having a subcommittee that could dig in and really work on this issue with the IAC, with other, maybe put a legislator as an ex-officio member of that to get them educated about what the issues are and why we're struggling, get their ideas, maybe it's the leaders you talked about that we pull in to come in as an ex-officio part of the subcommittee. I'm just throwing out ideas, but I think we need to identify a long-term solution.

Kevin Fuhr: As far as the short-term funding issue, I suggested that we have a small subcommittee of Council members that have maybe a legislator or two, somebody from DFM, can help resolve some of the short-term funding issues to try to get us back to where we need to be. As far as the long-term vision that you're talking about, we have the Training Subcommittee already in place. Gary Raney, when that 2020 vision came out, went around to the state, met with the chiefs and sheriffs, presented that. I actually still have a copy of that presentation on a thumb drive. We could have the Training Subcommittee work on that, can meet with their respective associations, and start promoting that again and talking to them about their training needs and if, trying to get some buy-in or some feedback on that.

Shaun Gough: You take forty-four counties, forty-four prosecutors offices, forty-four sheriffs offices, eight-eight PD's, and you throw out the number \$500,000, that's what we're short. That's \$2,800 per agency.

Kevin Fuhr: The problem is you're going to get some agencies that are going to say I just don't.

Shaun Gough: That doesn't include IDJC, ISP, DOC. That's nothing in the big scheme of things.

Kevin Fuhr: We've got the two different issues. The Training Subcommittee could tackle that and maybe add a member or two that you're talking about that could help promote the future training needs and vision of our training, and then try to get a small committee together or whatever the Council wants to do as far as the immediate financial needs.

Ralph Powell: When you say immediate, are we including fiscal year 17 or is that just the end of this fiscal year June 30th?

Kevin Fuhr: I would think that we're probably going to need to try to tackle 17 also. We know where we're going to stand this year. We've got the projections right now we're going to come in \$100,000 short plus it doesn't look like we're going to buy any of the equipment that we budgeted for because we're not going to have the funds, so I think in 17 we're going to have to do something 1) so we don't come in shorter at the end of the year, and 2) so we can maybe try to tackle some of those needs that we're not buying.

Paul Panther: When does ISP's FY 18 budget have to go in?

Ralph Powell: September.

Paul Panther: My question is whether we need to expedite some of these decisions to account for fiscal year 18 budget, making sure that we're in agreement before then.

Kevin Fuhr: Trying to bring the whole Council in to talk finances is going to be too difficult, and that's why I was suggesting a smaller group that could go out and tackle it in a timely immediate timeframe. My thought would be as far as a subcommittee goes, the financial subcommittee is to have from the Council the directors of some of the larger departments be on that subcommittee, somebody from IPAA so we've got some buy-in and we've got some of the people that, because when we start talking about financing POST, I think people are going to be looking to ISP and DOC and so it would be nice to have them on board with it.

Henry Atencio: It just feels like we're missing the bigger picture still. Maybe another way to look at this is what if we were facing a holdback. The four state agencies understand what that looks like, and I'm sure the counties do as well. Middle of the fiscal year we're told to hold back ten percent, hold back five percent. What we're forced to do is stop spending, stop travel, hold positions vacant, and it really forces some creativity and some belt tightening. I'm not suggesting that we're here today, but maybe that we look at it that way. I think if we're going to look at trying to get more money, we have to do some type of a gap analysis that looks at what are the statutory requirements, are we doing more than statute requires of us. If we are, identify that. Can we do away with that, and trim the fat if there's any to be trimmed, and then we say okay, we still need more money or guess what, we took care of our own problem by going this route. I have to go back to the dorm issues. Maybe we don't need a dormitory. There's hotels all over this city that we can perhaps contract with at a better rate to bring people in. I think there's just other ways we can look at. I think we're just trying to do everything we do today and ask for more money. In listening to Colonel Powell's comments from the meeting yesterday, I'm not sure that that's going to get very far, get a lot of traction unless they're looking at what else have we done first before we ask for more money. Maybe look at some type of gap analysis in that process.

Ralph Powell: That will also be an expectation I believe about where we go. That's the question. We've covered what POST has done so far, and perhaps what Henry Atencio's suggesting is we assemble some type of a group to evaluate and ask the question was there any more. I think they made a pretty noble effort here. We've got it listed, but we have to show that we have done all we can first.

Victor McCraw: Our most recent discussions have been about the CEC, which is the pay amounts and possible increases for state employees and how that affects POST because it all comes out of the same bucket. In the meeting with Adam Jarvis, I said hey, great, raises, and a second later I thought oh no. This money has to come from somewhere, and it's not always good news with the total financial picture. Internally, and Rory Olsen and I had a brief conversation about the positions that we have, the positions we're keeping open, and that played into who we're going to be able to afford to pay at what rate. What are these people actually doing, and how many people do we actually need to do that job? Possibly holding open one of our

upcoming vacancies and looking at what she does right now, a lot of those things are not mandated. A lot of the things that she does are going to be unpopular to discontinue, and I guarantee if I do it, people are going to have my head on a platter. But if the Council takes a good look at what we are statutorily required to do versus what we're doing, and considers whether we can cut it, even if we're talking about something as little as the printing of the Criminal Code Indexes. We don't even have a policy or procedure on printing code indexes. It's not in the statute, it's not in the rule, it's not anywhere. At \$6,000, which doesn't look like a lot except when I save that twice, I've got mats that I don't have now, and hopefully I reduce my injury rate for students hitting their heads on the gym floor. There's little things like that, to include the special certifications that POST issues. This person I'm talking about that's resigning spends a whole lot of time calculating hours and college credits and this and that for intermediate and everything else. It's in the rule that allows us to do it, it doesn't mandate that we do it. It's nowhere in statute. I know that agencies base their pay and promotions on these special POST certificates. I'm not sure that the agencies understand that two people with the same level certificate are in no way the same level of proficiency because it's an imprecise system. It's just kind of an atta boy from POST. If the agencies are willing to let go of that one thing, we could possibly work it so that we could save an entire position. There are probably several of those things that we can take a look at if that's something that you want us to do, and that's a departure from the way that we're doing business today. I know it's going to be looked at as a reduction of services. When we're getting phone calls about code indexes, it's definitely going to not be popular. It would be something to look at and it would help us with our planning internally at POST of what do we have to do, who do we need to do that, and how many of them do we need. We could definitely tell you what services we could provide and what services we recommend discontinuing or at least putting on hold until we get a handle on the financial situation.

Lorin Nielsen: We can play United States government and just keep having a deficit because everybody wants what they want, and nobody wants to give things up, and everybody wants to just keep going and going and going, but our state requires us to have a balanced budget. When the money is gone, the money is gone. So what would we do if we come up and folks, there is no money. That's a real good position to start with, and if we continue to, how can you go to the Legislature and say we need more money when you've not been able to document everything that you can do. You can't. If we start saying agencies help pay for this or we've got to come up with \$500,000, and to do that we are not going to be able to do this, we're not going to be able to do that, we're not going to be able to do that. Are they going to moan and groan? Absolutely. Who are they going to moan and groan to? They are going to moan and groan to the Legislature. They'll moan and groan to you too, that phone's going to be red hot, but let's take a look at how long do we have to keep trying to do the same thing and not have the money to provide it. I really think that a good dialogue has been given today on that direction, but you kind of put it into perspective. The money isn't there, or it's not going to be there, and we can maybe push it to this way and this way and move this way that way, and then move this down the road, and then down the road we'll still be in the same position. Maybe we need to be able to say this is it. This is what we need. This is how we get it done. We get it done by this, this, this, this, and this. We've got representatives from all of the stakeholders in here. I would have no problem of saying the money isn't there. It just is not there, and because of that, we're not going to have this particular thing that you've had before. We're not going to do books, we may not do this class.

We may have you do this in your areas. We may do this type of stuff until we can bring that up, but short term, I think that's what we have to do. We don't have the money. It's not there. We can't just keep pushing it down the road or kicking that can down the road. Long term is when we need to start saying alright, long term, once we get to that \$500,000 savings, what worked and what didn't. I like the idea of having a subcommittee, but I don't know if Training is really that place because when it comes to budget, there's a whole lot of other people that need to be on that.

Kevin Fuhr: I think Jan Bennetts was talking about two different things. One was the short-term funding and one was long-term training.

Jan Bennetts: And long-term funding. I think they're two separate issues. Short term is one thing and long term is a whole different thing.

Wayne Rausch: I agree with what Lorin Nielsen said, but it's all about priorities. If you're running Parks and Recreation and trails and a farm that nobody visits, but we spend all sorts of money on keeping the grass cut and all that kind of stuff, and that's part of somebody's pet little project, but something like public safety suffers because of stuff like that, and I'm sorry, but nationwide there is more waste going on. Why do we spend \$150,000,000,000 a year to send to a country who chants death to the United States, but then cut social security. It's all about priorities, and I think those priorities have something to do with this whole thing here. I think we need to make the case that do you want your public safety system in this state to work because it's a whole lot more important than your little pet project somewhere. Now granted, you can't tell some stuffed shirt politician that in those very same words, but you can certainly get the point across. I think there is money. I think it's a matter of priorities, and some people's I don't think are in the right place.

Lorin Nielsen: I've worked in politics for a while too, and I can tell you the only way that you're going to get their attention is have the public say I want this, and the only way the public and the administrators are going to say I need this, now we've gone from want to need, is to have it either taken away or have the reality of that might not be able to be at the cost that you're doing. It's going to cost you more to do it. I think the longer we postpone that. In my county they were having two fairs, and yet I can't hire anybody. The two people from the north and south part of the county, you're not going to play with my fair. But when you just put that aside and say how much more important is to be able to build this jail, because if I can't build it, they are staying out in your community and they're not coming in. You've got to be able to bring that alternative to them, and the alternative is we're \$500,000 in debt, give or take. This is short term. We may have to cut some of this stuff. We may not be able to do the things that we're doing, and we've got to be able to not do the things that we've been doing up to now. It's based to \$500,000, whatever that might be. Not going to be permanent, but that's what we've got to do until we can get it, and then we can go the other side. It may sound like a negative thing to our stakeholders, but for us to be able to get the powers to be that hold the purse strings, they've got to be able to hear somebody screaming, and this is one of the ways to get their attention. Cause they're not going to scream if they still get the same services, and we're the ones doing all the cutting.

Kevin Fuhr: I'm hearing that POST staff needs to look at where they're spending their money and see if there's anything more that can be cut. I know that we're not buying the equipment that's been appropriated, the mats and anything else. We've got open positions that are going unfilled. We can have them look at anything else that can be cut, but I think we're probably getting close to the point where we're going to start cutting services, and so that's something to be thinking about. If we're cutting academies, how's that going to work, but if that's what the Council wants, then we can have the administrator look at everything where he's spending money and see what else needs to be cut prior to going and asking for more money.

Victor McCraw: I think that the list that Colonel Powell had and that Lori Hicks put up on the screen, we've kind of exhausted everything that we are comfortable doing without the Council's permission because even little things like the code index, and I hate to bring that up again, but it raised a huge stir, and the decision has to be made does this harm our relationships with the agencies, and is it worth it. If it's not, then we leave it the way that it is and we provide them the ability to do it on their own and support them in whatever limited way we can. Back to Chief Lavey's comment, we need to get back to basic law enforcement training. There are certain things that are mandated in the statute. There's a ton of stuff in rule that's not necessarily mandated in the statute, and if we do start looking at those things, it's probably going to take the Council to vote on yeah or nay on whether we do those things. We can create a list for you, but we've already got a list of everything that we can do up to this point before things that have always been done by POST and have always been expected stop coming in order to preserve the things that are absolutely necessary.

Kevin Fuhr: This goes back to the earlier question this morning about who's POST. We are POST sitting in this room, so we're the ones that are going to end up making those decisions, so the phone calls are going to come to us. We're going to have to take responsibility for the actions that we choose as a body and not pawn them off on Victor McCraw and his staff and say well POST made that decision. It's going to fall on us, so we can have POST staff look to see if there's anywhere else they can cut other than what the list that we have, and like Victor McCraw's asking and I agree with him, anything that needs to be cut like the books or academy classes and stuff like that, we're going to have to make as a body.

Jan Bennetts: I think it would help me too, Victor McCraw, so hearing what we heard about salary savings. It looks like we're going to be \$190,000 to the good. I realize it's vacancies, and that's a service that we're giving, but we have it and we can use it for operations as I understood. We also don't have to have that \$300,000. There's no penalty, it's not statutory. I would just like to know what the bottom line is, and if I missed it, I'm sorry. What are we going to be short with what we currently have, with the savings that we're showing, what are we short in 2016, and I realize you may not know that for 17 yet, but to get us through this fiscal with what we heard today about salary savings, taking that into account. Putting that, and I know you said \$500,000, but I don't think that's 2016 is it.

Jeff Lavey: That's not minus the \$300,000 we should be keeping on the reserve though either.

Shaun Gough: But we're going to take that off the books. What's the bottom line?

Jeff Lavey: We're \$110 shy of that \$300,000.

Jan Bennetts: Right, but the \$300,000 as I understood it, that's the stuff I need to know what that final number is.

Kevin Fuhr: Lori Hicks, so that \$217,000 that we're projected to come in at the end of this fiscal year, where we were hoping for \$300,000, but we're going to come in with \$217,000. Does that \$217,000 include the salary savings money of \$190,000.

Lori Hicks: Yes.

Jan Bennetts: We need \$500,000 by the end of 16 is what I thought people were talking about.

Kevin Fuhr: I just threw this number out there. If we wanted to come in with \$300,000 and still be able to buy the equipment that we've got appropriated for but we don't have the money to spend, that's where I came up with that number. That was coming in at \$300,000 and then having a little bit of money to buy the things that we want to buy but we can't. So I threw it out there as far as having POST staff looking at cost savings. We heard Victor McCraw say that the list that we have is where they're comfortable at. Do we still want to have them take a look at it and then do we want to make decisions on.

Ralph Powell: What I heard Victor McCraw suggest was they could provide us a list of things that we need POST Council approval to cut. That's the list I would like to see next, and then I think that will be the completion of the final, this is what we squeeze out of our budget, so the question's asked, we've got one list of what they've done and another list of what POST Council can elect to cut.

Kevin Fuhr: We won't get that list until the June 2nd meeting. We still have the short-term funding issue that we need to try to tackle. Do we want to proceed forward with the short-term financial stuff or do we want to wait until we have this before we try to tackle that?

Wayne Rausch: I think we need that information, to be a little more specific.

Kevin Fuhr: The reason I asked that is because the longer we wait, the harder it might be to get everybody together in time to get to the Legislature.

Ralph Powell: So realizing the date of the next POST Council meeting, is that necessarily as soon as we can have that list? Can we get the list sooner?

Kevin Fuhr: We could get it sooner.

Victor McCraw: The most time consuming thing I think, which we should be able to get it done, assuming our folks have the time. I'd want every single POST employee to fill out a PDQ on all of their duties, and that way we'd know what they were doing, where they were spending their time, percentages of where they're spending their time, match that up against what we are

absolutely required to do by law, and start to take a look at what we could do without, not that we want to do without it, what could we do without.

Kevin Fuhr: Could we get that in a timely fashion?

Victor McCraw: I can get it done as quickly as possible. It's going to be easier for some employees than others.

Greg Wooten: Is June 2nd going to be enough time for us to actually save any money? That's the last month of the fiscal year, and most of the time we have to stop spending by June 1, so we're really not going to be able to do anything.

Kevin Fuhr: We're not going to save any money between now and then.

Ralph Powell: For fiscal year 16. As we look at 17, and the writing's already on the wall for 16. We're going to have to do what we've done in the past, and that's survive and pray for July 1.

Kevin Fuhr: POST staff is going to generate a new list that lists items that we as Council can decide whether we want to cut or not. Along with that, he said he'll have his employees list what they're currently doing, and are there things on the list that we could cut from them. Then we could decide whether we need all the people or not.

Greg Wooten: The next part, I think, what Henry Atencio was referring to is the gap analysis. That's a critical piece of that, so that's a huge part of the picture is this is what we're spending our money on. This is where we're short. This is what we have cut to try to get us back to not being short, so here's your decision. We have to continue to not do these services or we have to have some enhancements.

Ralph Powell: Being fair to Victor McCraw and his staff, position description questionnaires, you don't just snap your fingers. He's going to need until June, and he'll wish he had more time than that.

Victor McCraw: I'm not implying that anybody who works for POST is sitting around wasting their time doing things. They're all doing things that are expected to be done, but what are the consequences of those particular things not being done, and do they compromise our statutory obligations I think is the question, and probably some hard decisions need to be made after that.

Wayne Rausch: Absolutely, because you have to look at both sides of the equation, which is what are the services that are needed that we're not providing, which is to look at this thing holistically we have to, and also I think another thing that's important, I know I do it in my budget every year, how much more is all this stuff costing out there in the market. The budget is shrinking just by the fact that everything costs more, and that needs to be included too I think.

Kevin Fuhr: So Victor McCraw will bring that to us in June. Then we can make some tough decisions at that meeting. So we can hold off on the short-term funding until we have that

meeting, and then we can decide then how we want to proceed with the short-term funding requests.

Lorin Nielsen: Will there be enough time in June's meeting to be able to take that on along with everything else that we have scheduled for a regular meeting?

Kevin Fuhr: I don't know what the June meeting's looking like yet, but we've generally been getting out of that meeting at about 2:00 or so. So if we could tackle a few hours after that, maybe get out of here by 4:00 or 5:00, might be a little bit longer meeting.

Shane Turman: On this sheet of the cost savings, can we get a copy of this? And also, maybe what the cost is being saved on each one of those so we could take it back to our regions.

Lorin Nielsen: If that could be sent out to us so that we'd have it before we come, that would be nice.

Kevin Fuhr: The agenda goes out about a week early.

Henry Atencio: I still don't know what the projected deficit is for fiscal year 2016.

Kevin Fuhr: It's projected we'll end up with \$217,000 in our account at the end of the fiscal year. That includes all moneys that we have on hand, whether it's salary savings or savings from not buying equipment, it's everything.

Shaun Gough: So you've taken \$300,000 and already projected it into next year, so we're \$100,000 short.

Ralph Powell: \$217,000 is for, we have to make payroll. It's already earmarked for July 1 payroll and for the OE that has to be paid to keep the facility going.

Jan Bennetts: In other words, we're not going to lose anything in 2016 through June 30th. Right now we're good, and now we're looking at 2017.

Greg Wooten: We're just going to miss our \$300,000.

Jan Bennetts: Right, but there's no penalty.

Josh Tewalt: I think the easiest way to think about POST funding is it's not a regular government budget. It's like a checking account, but you need permission to write checks on it, so even though the fiscal year ends June 30th, that money doesn't go away. You keep the cash. What gets renewed for July 1 is the spending authority from the Legislature, so all the cost savings that you're going to do between now and June 30th, you're just protecting that cash balance. That's all you're doing. There's not money that's going to go away. There's not new money that's going to appear short of the regular revenue streams, so you just have to think of it like a checking account. The balance is what you're trying to protect.

Lorin Nielsen: In a county budget, we have a reserve that we're required to take, and that's what I thought that \$300,000 was kind of like a reserve to be able to take care of until the new revenues start coming in. We don't have anything in that reserve now or do we have \$300,000 in that reserve that hasn't been touched? We don't have a reserve, and so in your projections, you have to have around \$300,000 to be able to take care of that extended until the revenues start coming in, and that's what we're going to be short. We'll have \$217,000, and we'll be short \$83,000.

Kevin Fuhr: That \$300,000 I thought was a number that we had to have, but apparently it's not required, it's just kind of a best case.

Shaun Gough: If you don't have it, how do you spend it?

Kevin Fuhr: If we've got \$217,000, what does it cost to do payroll and expenditures that first.

Jan Bennetts: \$75,000 is what I thought.

Lorin Nielsen: \$150,000 for the month.

Kevin Fuhr: So we should have enough with \$217,000. It's just like in your check book. Do you want to write the last check knowing that you have \$6 in your account or do you want to write the last check knowing you've got \$6,000 in your account. We're writing a check at the end of this fiscal year, and we're going to end up with pennies, not dollars.

Jeff Lavey: And hope we don't break another pipe in the dorm.

Kevin Fuhr: Not have some major issue where we're going to have to come up with some money.

Lorin Nielsen: It is definitely a bare bones budget. I'm surprised.

Kevin Fuhr: POST staff has got some direction they're going to bring back to us, so we'll make some decisions come June. Short-term funding we'll deal with that also at that same time.

Shaun Gough made a motion to adjourn. Wayne Rausch seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,



Victor R. McCraw
Division Administrator
Idaho Peace Officer Standards & Training